

THE RUSSIAN REVIEW



*An American Quarterly
Devoted to Russia
Past and Present*

July
1950

Vol. 9, No. 3

Price \$1.00

Contributors to This Issue

DIMITRI VON MOHRENSCHILDT is Professor of Russian History and Literature at Dartmouth College and Editor of *The Russian Review*.

MAX LASERSON is Lecturer in Contemporary Civilization at Columbia University and author of *Russia and the Western World*, N. Y. 1945.

GEORGE C. GUINS, Magister in Russian Law, is the author of several books (in Russian) in the field of Social Science and Law and of numerous articles in American periodicals; at present is Lecturer in Political Science and Russian, The Institute of Slavic Studies, University of California.

ALEXANDRA FREDERICKS has contributed occasional articles to American periodicals, including one on Pushkin in the Spring, 1946, issue of *The Russian Review*.

VALENTINE TSCHEBOTARIOFF-BILL was Research Assistant at The Institute of Advanced Study at Princeton from 1939 to 1944; since 1946 has been Lecturer in Russian at Princeton, and in 1948 was also appointed Adjunct Assistant Professor of History in the Graduate School of Arts and Science at New York University.

J. A. POSIN is Associate Professor of Russian at Stanford University, and author of articles and reviews in literary periodicals.

THE RUSSIAN REVIEW

An American Quarterly Devoted to Russia
Past and Present

Vol. 9

JULY 1950

No. 3

★ ★ ★

Postwar Party Line of the All-Union Communist Party of the U.S.S.R., <i>Dimitri von Mohrenschildt</i>	171
Alexander Radishchev—An Early Admirer of America, <i>Max M. Laserson</i>	179
Law Does Not Wither Away in the Soviet Union, <i>George C. Guins</i>	187
Souvenir of a Petrograd Evening, <i>Alexandra Fredericks</i>	205
National Feudalism in Muscovy, <i>Valentine Tschebotarioff-Bill</i>	209
From Zoshchenko's Sketches, <i>J. A. Posin</i>	219

BOOK REVIEWS

Economic Geography of the U.S.S.R., <i>ed. by S. S. Balzak, V. F. Vasyutin, and Ya. G. Feigin, B. Zaborski</i>	229
Leaves from a Russian Diary, <i>by Pitirim Sorokin, Warren B. Walsh</i>	233
Guests of the Kremlin, <i>by Robert Emmens, C. E. Black</i>	235
Comparative Economic Systems, <i>by Ralph Blodgett, Harry Schwartz</i>	235

Continued on Page II

Mediaeval Russian Churches, <i>by</i> Samuel Cross, <i>Nicholas Riasanovsky</i>	236
<i>Chetyrnadtsat</i> , <i>by</i> G. V. Golokhvastov, D. A. Magula, and others, <i>Leonid Strakhovsky</i>	239
Some Recent Russian Language Texts, <i>John N. Washburn</i>	240

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books and Articles on Russia Published in 1949, <i>Robert Swanton</i>	243
Letter to the Editor.....	260

THE RUSSIAN REVIEW

Dimitri von Mohrenschildt
Editor

Michael Karpovich

Warren B. Walsh

Alexis Wiren

The aim of "The Russian Review" is to present a non-partisan interpretation of Russian history, civilization, and culture. The Review invites contributions by authors of divergent views, but the opinions expressed in any individual article in this journal are not necessarily those of the editors.

Books for review and correspondence concerning reviews should be sent to Professor Warren B. Walsh, 113 Maxwell, Syracuse University, Syracuse 10, New York.

Copyright 1950, and published quarterly in January, April, July, and October by "The Russian Review," 215 West 23rd Street, New York 11, N. Y. Subscription rates: \$4.00 a year in the United States; Canada \$4.50; foreign \$5.00, single copy \$1.00. The contents of this publication cannot be reprinted without the permission of the editors. Unsolicited manuscripts will not be returned unless accompanied by stamped, self-addressed envelopes.

Postwar Party Line of the All-Union Communist Party of the U.S.S.R.

BY DIMITRI VON MOHRENSCHILDT

THE first year of the Soviet-German war, 1941-42, was a critical period for the Soviet régime. Defeatism, desertion, and collaboration with the enemy were widespread. From June 22 to October 19, 1941, over two million Russians surrendered.¹

In the words of Lenin describing defeatism in 1917, the Russians "have voted with their heels," this time on a much larger scale. To judge from the numerous accounts of the first year of the war in Russian language periodicals published in New York, Paris, and Western Germany in recent years, many by eye-witnesses, the Red Army soldiers were unwilling to die for Stalin and "Scientific Socialism," while the population of the Ukraine and the North Caucasus regarded Stalin as their enemy number one and Hitler as enemy number two.²

What checked this elemental defeatism? There is little doubt that the credit must go first of all to the Nazis themselves. The atrocities perpetrated by the SS units and the Gestapo on the civilian population of the occupied territories, the mistreatment of war prisoners, Hitler's unwillingness to give full support to the "liberation movement" headed by General A. A. Vlasov—all these were determining factors in changing the tide. For this Stalin and the Communist Party should owe Hitler an eternal debt of gratitude. In addition, Stalin's policy during the first year of the war was also a factor in stiffening the resistance of the army and in checking defeatism. It was a two-pronged policy. First, desertion and surrender by whole military units was proclaimed treason. Rather than surrender, every soldier and commander was ordered to save the last bullet for himself.

¹From the files of the German Foreign Armies, see Wallace Carroll, "It Takes a Russian to Beat a Russian," *Life*, December 19, 1949.

²Scores of articles on this subject have appeared in *Novyi Zhurnal*, New York; *Sotsialisticheskii Vestnik*, New York; *Vozrozhdenie*, Paris; and *Possev*, Western Germany.

Simultaneously, there was a general revival of patriotic slogans stressing nationalism pure and simple. The war with Germany became the War of Liberation, the Great Patriotic War, and the appeal to the masses was frankly made in "Holy Russia" terms. To widen the basis for popular support, the Party opened its ranks. Every effort was made to recruit as many members as possible, particularly among the Red Army personnel. Marxism-Leninism was increasingly soft-pedaled and further concessions were made both to popular demand at home as well as to the Allies. Thus, the Patriarchate was restored and the Comintern abolished. It was even vaguely hinted that there would be major changes after the war in the collective farm system. The Party relinquished its iron control and a more liberal attitude was clearly observable on the intellectual front, especially in literature.

With victory in sight, there appeared an increasing indication of a Marxist revival. More attention began to be paid in the Soviet press to proper indoctrination and greater discipline, particularly in regions liberated from the Germans. Typical is the following statement from an editorial in *Pravda*, October 17, 1944: "It is the duty of Party organizations to stimulate tirelessly the political activity of the workers. . . . Particular attention must be paid to implementing in the population a socialist attitude toward labor and public property, strengthening state discipline and overcoming the private property, anti-collective farm and anti-state tendencies planted by the German occupants."³

Shortly after VE Day and throughout 1945 in the speeches of the leaders and in the press, more and more emphasis was laid on the perils of capitalist encirclement and the superiority of the Soviet system over capitalism. At the same time attacks on the "reactionary" policy of the United States and Great Britain became more and more pronounced.⁴

When the war ended, it was apparent that the All-Union Communist Party faced a serious crisis. The problems were many and serious. Some were economic in nature—rehabilitation of devastated areas, shortage of trained personnel, appalling inadequacy of housing—these problems and the way the Party went about solving them is outside the province of this article. The other problems which

³Quoted from John S. Curtis and Alex Inkeles, "Marxism in the USSR—The Recent Revival," *Political Science Quarterly*, September, 1946.

⁴See, for example, Kalinin's address to the Moscow District Party Conference in 1945 published in *Propaganda and Agitation*, No. 18 (1945).

engaged the Party's immediate attention could properly be described as those of morale, both of the Party members and of the non-Party masses. These involved different groups and strata of Soviet society.

The first group to be affected by the war was the Party itself. It grew too large and unwieldy in the course of the war. Its wartime recruits were not properly indoctrinated. To achieve greater cohesion and doctrinal orthodoxy, a quiet purge of the Party membership went on after 1946.⁵

The Red Army was the next group seriously affected by the war. Almost two million Red Army soldiers had seen Europe and were impressed by what they saw. Upon their return home, they began to express doubts as to the superiority of Communism over Capitalism. There was, also, friction between high Army Command and the Party. The Party reacted to this situation with the usual energy and determination. Many important military commanders were dismissed or demoted, and thousands of trained agitators were sent out to discredit the soldiers' stories about the wonders of the capitalist world. Soon all grumblings and expressions of discontent were silenced.

The collective farm workers were another group that got out of hand in the course of the war. With the slackening of the Party control throughout the war, they appropriated lands which belonged to the collective farms, began to cultivate these, and enriched themselves through the sale of farm products on the legalized black market. Once again the Party faced a hostile village. The spectre of the returning *kulak* was haunting it. To judge from the Soviet press, much, if not most, of the energy of the Party in the first two years following the war was directed towards the checking of the individualistic tendencies of the farmers. By the end of 1947 this situation apparently was fairly well in hand. The land which the farmers had illegally appropriated in the course of the war was forcibly taken away from them; many were punished, and their cash reserves were drained by the currency reform of 1947.⁶

But the problem of postwar morale was nowhere so acute as on the intellectual front. Encouraged by the Party's relatively liberal attitude during the war, many Soviet intellectuals expressed open friendship for the United States and admiration for Western culture.

⁵See Merle Fainsod "Postwar Role of the Communist Party," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, May, 1949.

⁶B. Alexandrov, "The Soviet Currency Reform," *The Russian Review*, January, 1949.

American observers are unanimous in their testimony of the many and varied manifestations of Soviet intelligentsia's friendship towards America. Some expressed hopes of further and closer collaboration with Western Allies; a few Soviet scientists went so far as to publish articles in American scientific journals. A general apathy for Marxism-Leninism seemed to have reigned on the intellectual front.⁷

It is obvious that these trends presented a serious threat to the Party's leadership and their further growth could not be tolerated. So, early in 1946, in an effort to restore the morale at home and to prepare the people for an eventual conflict with the West, the Politbureau formulated a policy which remains the official postwar Party line. The Party tightened its control over all phases of Soviet life. The new policy implied first of all the strengthening of the doctrinal attitude, and the fostering of a militant Party outlook (*partiinosť*). Also, an attempt was made to formulate a new brand of patriotism—a kind of synthesis of Marxism-Leninism and nationalism.

The new policy was outlined by the Party leaders, particularly by Zhdanov, and was expounded in the leading Soviet periodicals, *Culture and Life*, *Bolshevik*, *Problems of Philosophy*, and others.⁸

A gigantic campaign was under way. All the means of Soviet propaganda—the press, radio, theater, and literature—were mobilized to expound the new official policy and to explain it in terms comprehensible to different strata of Soviet society. Based on an analysis of the Soviet press and periodicals, the main feature of the new Party line was a concentrated attack on what was termed “survivals of capitalism.” These were admitted to exist in the economic sphere as well as in the “consciousness of the people.” According

⁷See Frederick Barghoorn, “The Soviet Union between War and Cold War,” *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, May, 1949. Also by the same author, “What Russians Think of Americans,” *Foreign Affairs*, January, 1948.

⁸Some of the key speeches on the new Party line were the following: Stalin's election speech of February, 1946, dealing with the nature and causes of capitalist wars; Zhdanov's speech of August, 1946, attacking the Leningrad periodicals, *Zvezda* and *Leningrad*; Zhdanov's speech of June, 1947, attacking Alexandrov's *History of Western European Philosophy*; Malenkov's report to the organizing conference of the Cominform in September, 1947; Zhdanov's speech at the same Cominform conference.

to official pronouncements, these survivals constituted the major obstacle in the transition of Soviet Socialism towards Communism.⁹

Zhdanov and other purveyors of the new Party line maintained that Stalin had worked out a complete theory of Soviet society during the transitional period from Socialism to Communism. That theory, it was said, represented a further development of Marx' dialectics.¹⁰

The postwar task of the Communist Party, it was announced, consisted in finding "ways of developing Communist consciousness in Soviet men and women" and "methods of overcoming capitalist survivals in people's consciousness." It is interesting to discover what the Party regards as the most persistent "capitalist survivals" in Soviet society. The most frequently mentioned are the following: individualistic tendencies in general (particularly those of the collective farmers), profiteering, cheating on work units, bureaucratic red tape, unsocialist attitude to labor and state property, "kowtowing to bourgeois culture," "nationalistic exclusiveness"; sometimes even drunkenness and religious superstitions were added.¹¹

In all the official expositions of the new Party line it was stated that the capitalist survivals must and can be eradicated, and that this can only be accomplished through the application of the super-science—Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism.¹²

According to official purveyors of the new line, the basic tenets of this new "science" (class warfare and dialectical and historical materialism as developed and interpreted by Stalin) are henceforth to be applied consistently by all Soviet artists, writers, philosophers, scientists, and economists in their own respective fields.

⁹S. Kovalyov, "Ideological Conflicts in Soviet Russia," *Public Affairs Press*, 1948. (Translation of an article published in the March, 1947, issue of *Bolshevik*.)

¹⁰The argument, as developed by Zhdanov, runs like this: progress is achieved through the struggle of opposites; in a class-divided society, the struggle is between classes, but in Socialist society, such as the Soviet Union, the struggle is between the old and the new, and the form it takes is found in the process of criticism and self-criticism. This, Zhdanov explains, is "a new manifestation of the dialectic law." Zhdanov's address to the philosophers at the meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, June 24, 1947.

¹¹See S. Kovalyov *op. cit.*, and A. M. Egorin, "The Ideological Content of Soviet Literature," *Public Affairs Press*, 1948, and previously cited speeches of Zhdanov.

¹²Zhdanov occasionally defines the doctrine of Marxism-Leninism as "an instrument of creative inquiry."

It is only upon these terms that they could continue their work in Soviet society. The Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party is taking it upon itself to provide the "guidance" and "inspiration" in this gigantic campaign for re-education.

The Party's postwar campaign of combating and eradicating capitalist survivals applied, it would appear, to all strata of Soviet society. One feature, however, of this campaign—the attack on "bourgeois" or "rootless cosmopolitanism" was singled out for special emphasis and applied primarily to Soviet intelligentsia. Every important speech and editorial in the Soviet press in the past three years made a special point of excoriating this "crime." Today, "cosmopolitanism" is one of the most serious crimes one can be accused of and is practically synonymous with treason.

"A rootless cosmopolite" (*bezrodnyi kosmopolit*) has been variously defined as "a person who rejects love of his own people and country," or one who "kowtows" or shows servility to Western culture. This attitude, the official purveyors of the line maintain, is a survival of Tsarist times and was once typical of Tsarist intelligentsia. It is said to be no longer excusable, since Soviet society has reached "a higher stage of development and consciousness than the West."¹³ "Bourgeois cosmopolitanism," states the *New World*, "stems from a disdainful attitude towards one's Motherland, one's culture, one's traditions."¹⁴ Elsewhere, cosmopolitanism is described as "a weapon of Imperialist reaction" or, as the Academician Mitin has put it: "a screen for the unbridled activity of the most reactionary forces of Anglo-American imperialism. It is their ideological weapon with the help of which they are trying to weaken the people's will to defend their national sovereignty. . . ." ¹⁵ Cosmopolitanism in art, K. Simonov explains, "is the endeavor to replace Gorky by Sartre, Tolstoy by the pornographer Miller, to replace classical art which ennobles mankind by stupefying Hollywood concoctions."¹⁶ In science cosmopolitanism implies an erroneous assumption of the universal character of science. Thus, according to *Problems of Philosophy*: "Marxism-Leninism shatters into bits the cosmopolitan fictions concerning supra-class, non-national, universal science and definitely proves that science like all culture in modern society is

¹³Zhdanov's speech of August, 1946.

¹⁴No. 6, 1948.

¹⁵*Literary Gazette*, March 9, 1949.

¹⁶*Pravda*, February 28, 1949.

national in form and class in content.”¹⁷ Finally, *Problems of Economics* contributes the following definition on the subject:

Cosmopolitanism is the poisoned weapon of American imperialism striving to annihilate the independence of peoples and for world hegemony. Cosmopolitans are deserters from the people [*otshchepentsy naroda*], without love for the Motherland, indifferent to its interests and fate, cringing to the bourgeois West, with no feeling of pride in their country. The Soviet people despises and hates homeless cosmopolitans; the weeds of cosmopolitanism . . . are not yet completely eradicated from our economic writings.¹⁸

It would be unprofitable to cite further illustrations. The term “cosmopolitanism” evidently applies to a variety of trends inimical to Marxism-Leninism. At home, it refers to all forms of revisionism and “left” deviationism (hence its anti-semitic implications) which apparently are still persisting among certain strata of Soviet society. Also, the attack on cosmopolitanism is apparently the Party’s method of discrediting, at home and abroad, the various projects of federated and world government.

Simultaneously with attacks on cosmopolitanism, the Party has been featuring since 1946 another slogan—“Soviet Patriotism”—an attitude opposite to cosmopolitanism and one which the Party is trying systematically to inculcate into the consciousness of the masses. According to Zhdanov, “Soviet Patriotism” means first of all “pride in one’s Socialist Motherland”; in other words, it implies devotion to the Soviet system and way of life. Patriotism of the type promoted during the war is no longer tolerated. What is demanded of the Soviet citizen today is the strictest allegiance to the Soviet state and ideology, *not to Russia*. In all official pronouncements “Soviet Patriotism” is invariably opposed to “bourgeois nationalism.” “The Communist Party,” says *Bolshevik*, “in educating the masses in the spirit of internationalism, at the same time fights against national nihilism, against an indifferent attitude toward national consciousness of people.”¹⁹

To a Western “bourgeois” mind, the contradictions of the Party’s present official position appear insurmountable. How, in fact, is it possible to reconcile present day chauvinism—claims of priority in inventions, of uniqueness and superiority of Soviet culture, etc.—with Marxist internationalism as understood by the original Bolshevik leaders? What sense does it make to say that it is proper for

¹⁷No. 3, 1949.

¹⁸March, 1949.

¹⁹March, 1947.

the Russians to take pride in their "Socialist Motherland," but that a similar emotion on the part of the Yugoslavs for *their* Motherland is a crime? The Kremlin dialecticians are not bothered by such problems. Stalin is the ultimate authority, and dialectics in his interpretation conveniently maintains that progress is impossible without a clash of contradictory forces or ideas.

In the past three years, as a result of the Party's postwar campaign, numerous Soviet writers, scientists, and artists were served notice to admit their errors and to conform to the new Party line. Those accused duly recanted. Here, for example, is a typical recantation of Kedrov, former editor of the periodical *Problems of Philosophy*:

I consider it my party duty to declare that I fully agree with the criticism and decisively condemn the preaching of inimical cosmopolitan views which I permitted. The danger of such views has become particularly evident now when our Party and our whole Soviet people are conducting a resolute campaign along the whole ideological front against rotted "bourgeois" ideology, against "bourgeois" cosmopolitanism as an ideological weapon of American imperialism. In these circumstances the slightest propaganda of cosmopolitan views is a direct betrayal of the cause of Communism, a direct departure from the principles of Marxism-Leninism. Any error of a cosmopolitan character is not only a theoretical one, but also a political one, since it is directly harmful to the work of nurturing Soviet patriotism in our Soviet people. . . . The root of my errors is in that of violating the Marxist principle of party spirit in philosophy and deviating towards "bourgeois" objectivism and apoliticism. . . . I consider it my serious fault that I did not heed in time the voice of the party criticism and did not instantly abandon my defective views.²⁰

From this survey, one conclusion seems inevitable. The very virulence with which the Party's postwar campaign is conducted and the objectives it holds in mind, strongly suggest serious tensions and stresses in various strata of Soviet society. Apparently, thirty-one years of indoctrination were not sufficient to win the mind and soul of Russians to the official Soviet ideology. Its shallowness was fully revealed in 1941-42 when millions of Russians shook it off overnight.

²⁰A letter to *Culture and Life*, March 16, 1949.

Alexander Radishchev—An Early Admirer of America*

BY MAX M. LASERSON

Northern America, with her Washington and Franklin, was invoked by the inexperienced Russian youth to turn their wonderful dreams of freedom and human perfection into reality.

Memoirs of Philip Viegel (Part III).

IT was while Francis Dana, sent by the Continental Congress in the vain hope of getting Russian recognition and support, was living in St. Petersburg that Alexander Radishchev wrote his *Ode to Freedom*. A meeting of the two would not have been unlikely. St. Petersburg's total population then was about 300,000 and the upper strata of its society was, of course, much smaller. They must have frequented the same sections of the city, and probably they passed each other—maybe even rubbed shoulders on some of the avenues or squares of the capital. It would have been possible for them to have spoken together since Radishchev had a relatively good command of English. But Dana was an unrecognized and officially unwelcome guest who lived in St. Petersburg unknown and unknowing, separated from those Russian radicals who admired Dana's young, fighting, pioneer country. If Dana and Radishchev did pass each other on the streets or elsewhere, they went by without realizing that they were spiritual brothers who held the same political creed.

The first political writing of Radishchev was the very long and somewhat pompously written poem entitled *Ode to Freedom*, inspired mainly by the American revolution and written between 1781 and 1783. The boldness of his writing this poem is so much the more amazing because the author, who attacked monarchic tyranny and serfdom and hailed Cromwell and Washington as leaders of people's revolutions against the kings and tyrants, was himself an aristocratic landlord and an official of the Imperial Russian government. Besides, the *Ode* was written in the second half of Catherine's reign,

*This is a very much shortened version of a chapter from Professor Laserson's forthcoming book: *The American Impact on Russia, Diplomatic and Ideological, 1784-1917*, which will be published by the Macmillan Company in August, 1950. Ed.]

when her first heroic years of liberalism and benevolence to French *encyclopédisme* turned into crass defense of the Russian autocracy and to an intensive foreign policy of expansion and conquest involving the extermination of that limited constitutional monarchism with which the young Catherine once flirted. He was always aware of the punishment which awaited him, and still he did not try in the prefaces of his subversive writings (in the *Ode* or in the following essays) to evade responsibility before the authorities by asserting that "no mischief can follow from his reasoning" as did some greater—much greater—thinkers, for example, Grotius, Spinoza, and Abbé Raynal. Defending democracy and freedom in the very citadel of Russian autocracy and rejecting at the outset any compromises with the almighty ruler, he became the most noble forerunner of the daring Decembrists.

Credit must be given to V. Semennikov, who, in his book on Radishchev, mentioned that some stanzas of the *Ode* were written under the impression of Abbé Raynal's book, *The Revolution of America*.¹ Radishchev himself testified that Raynal's *A Philosophical and Political History of the British Settlements in North America* inspired him in writing the *Ode*. But he did not mention *The Revolution of America*.²

The first daring political essay which Radishchev published was a "Letter to a Friend Living in Tobolsk," which was written immediately after the unveiling of the monument to Peter the Great (1782) in the presence of the Empress, high officials, diplomats, and thousands of cheering inhabitants. Radishchev used this occasion to criticize royal power which was directed against the personal liberty of the subjects. Said Radishchev:

Peter upon common recognition was given the title "the Great." But for what was he called so? Alexander, the destroyer of the half of the globe, was styled "the Great"; Constantin, who bathed in the blood of his son, was also called "the Great"; Charles I, the first renewer of the Roman Empire, was called so; Leo, the Pope of Rome, the protector of sciences and arts, was proclaimed "the Great"; Cosimo I Medici, the Duke of Tuscany, was recognized as "the Great"; the good-hearted French King Henry IV was called "the Great"; Frederick II, the king of Prussia, already during his life became "the

¹V. P. Semennikov, *Radishchev-Ocherki i issledovaniya* (Radishchev—Essays and Investigations), Moscow and Petrograd, 1923, pp. 5-7.

²About this book Radishchev wrote that he considered it to be the beginning of his "unfortunate mood," an expression which he used when brutally cross-examined by the political police of Catherine.

Great." All these rulers, not to mention hosts of others whom servile flattery called "the Great," received this title because of having rendered outstanding services to their fatherlands, though possessing great vices. . . . Despite the citizen of Geneva [J. J. Rousseau] Peter was correctly and of merit called "the Great," being an unusual and outstanding man.

At the end of this sober eulogy on the worldly Russian reformer, Radishchev, however, added a paragraph which caused Catherine later to characterize him as "the first advocate of the French Revolution in Russia."³

Let me not diminish myself in your eyes, my beloved friend, if I extol such an ambitious autocrat, who exterminated the last signs of his fatherland's wild freedom. He is dead and one dead cannot be flattered. But he could have been much more glorious had he lifted himself and elevated his fatherland to the freedom of persons. Though there were some cases in which kings abdicated from their thrones . . . there is no instance and will not be to the end of time that a king should voluntarily give up even a part of his power as long as he is sitting on his throne.

The most important work of Radishchev was his book *A Journey from St. Petersburg to Moscow*, in which the *Ode to Freedom* was inserted, and more subjects concerning America's new established political and social order were elaborated.

One important circumstance has to be taken into consideration. When the *Ode* was originally written, there was only one successful revolution—that of the former British colonies. France became the helper of the American Revolution without knowing that it would itself follow in time and would exceed America in sweeping away the old régime, but at the time when Radishchev wrote his *Journey*, the French Revolution was still in the future. When the book appeared (1790), Catherine was horrified by the "deeds" of the French rebellion and took all steps to fight against France and to support her counter-revolutionary enemies. She was compelled to suppress the book and to punish the author.

The pro-American feelings of Radishchev might have appeared even more subversive than his moral support of the French Revolution. America became toward the end of the 1780's and the beginning of the 1790's the fortress of well-established "Jacobins," while the results of the French rebellion might have seemed to be uncertain. The changing fortunes of the revolutionary and counter-revolutionary wars, before and after the execution of Louis XVI,

³Cf. A. N. Radishchev, *Polnoye sobranie sochinenii* (Collected Works), Moscow-Leningrad, 1938, Vol. I, pp. 150-151 and 461.

produced an unstable situation. In America, however, any restoration was unthinkable. And the only way to get the United States back in the councils of the counter-revolution was through the nets of foreign relations. This is why the pro-American Radishchev was doubly hated.

He began with criticisms concerning the previous stages of conquest which preceded and partly accompanied the emergence of a free America. And he was undoubtedly under the influence of Abbé Raynal's *History of the Settlements and Trade of the Europeans* when he wrote about the acts of the "Europeans who have destroyed and ruined America, irrigated her plains with the blood of the natives. But they replaced their murder by new acquisitiveness. The devastated fields of this suffering hemisphere began to feel the plow which turns up the clod."

However, there was great difference between Raynal and Radishchev. While Raynal defended the American interests of Bourbon France in contrast to Great Britain and her minister Pitt, mentioning only in passing that justice and humanity were neglected in the conquest of America, Radishchev, as a writer educated along the teachings of natural law, and as an ardent humanist wrote this about the conquest of America:

Having commonly sacrificed the Indians, the malicious Europeans, the preachers of peaceful love for the sake of the true God, these teachers of meekness and of love to mankind did not limit themselves to murderous conquest but purchased new slaves for money [from Africa]. These unfortunate victims of the burning banks of the Niger and the Senegal, torn from their homes and families, transferred to lands unknown to them, and put under the heavy sceptre of order, now till the prolific cornfields of America, which despises their toils. Should we call this country of desolation a blessed one only because her fields are not covered by bramble bush but covered by various plants? Shall we call her blessed because hundreds of her citizens roll in a flood of luxury while thousands are deprived of a secured livelihood and of a roof against heat and frost? O, that they should be devastated, these abundant countries! That thorns and thistles shall augment their roots deeply to extinguish all the precious fruits of America!

And hinting at the Russian serf-owning landlords, he added in the conclusion of this emphatic paragraph: "Tremble, my beloved ones, that no one shall say about you: 'Change the name and the parable is narrated about thee.' (*Mutato nomine de te fabula narratur.*)" ⁴

⁴*The Journey*, see the chapter entitled "Khotilov," pp. 249-251 of the original edition.

Despite the sins of the conquerors and the transgression of the natural rights of the native Indians, Radishchev emphasized the difference between the period of conquest and that of the newly established American colonies turning to a new, independent political existence. In this relation Radishchev followed the general tradition of the enlightened eighteenth century literature, which regarded the United States as a continuation and development of European political history.

Most remarkable in this regard was the rôle which Radishchev ascribed to the idea of liberty in general and particularly to the freedom of press. In the first stages of the fight of Russian free-thinkers and liberals the freedom of press was the most important freedom, since without such a freedom no dispersion of anti-autocratic views could ever be accomplished. Milton in England, Voltaire in France, and Radishchev in Russia wrote on their shields "freedom of press" in the hope of having it realized in legislation after a national revolution.

In this, America was the pattern for the *élite* of enlightened Russia; and Radishchev was the mediator between the American ideal and the sad Russian reality. In his *Journey* he dedicated a whole chapter to the history of the suppression of freedom of thought. America was to him the country which had found the just and correct decision on this question. In a subchapter entitled "A Short Narration on the Genesis of Censorship" ⁵ he began his survey with the instigations of the priests of Athens, who led the people to prohibit the writings of Protagoras. He insisted that censorship had common roots with the Inquisition.

While cowardly mistrust of things affirmed compelled the monks to establish censorship and to extirpate thought at its very birth, Columbus dared to pierce into the incertitude of the seas to discover America. Kepler foresaw the existence of the natural power of gravitation, finally proved by Newton. Simultaneously, Copernicus, who described the movement of the celestial bodies in space, was born. But to our deepest regret, about the fate of human reasoning we have to say that grand ideas frequently begot ignorance. The letterpress printing gave birth to censorship; the rationalist philosophy of the eighteenth century produced the teaching of the Illuminates.

Subsequently he described the deadening results of clerical and secular censorship in the most important Western countries of the postmedieval times. He dwelt upon Luther's Reformation and emphasized that by the weakening of the Roman Church and by the

⁵See chapter "Torzhok" of the *Journey*.

crumbling away of certain confessions from Rome (particularly during the Thirty Years' War), there appeared an abundance of books which were printed without any stigma of censorship. But in France and other countries freedom of the press continued to be restrained. It was England after its glorious revolution and particularly the United States of America which forever put an end to the domination of violence over reason.

Radishchev's is the first Russian book to quote articles and sections of American constitutional law as models of political justice and toleration. In contradistinction to Catherine, who dared only to apostrophize, plagiarize, and vaguely stylize western authors, Radishchev, her former page and pupil, went some steps further by importing to an autocratic country in defiance of its censorship exact dicta of Western, particularly American constitutional law. He quoted the preamble to the Constitution of Pennsylvania (1776); Paragraph XII of its Declaration of Rights, which runs as follows: "That the people have a right to freedom of speech, and of writing, and publishing their sentiments; therefore the freedom of press ought not to be restrained"; and Section 35 of its "Plan or Frame of Government," which proclaimed: "The printing presses shall be free to every person who undertakes to examine the proceedings of the legislature, or any part of government."

He further quoted: the Constitution of Maryland (1776), particularly Article XXXVIII—"That the liberty of press ought to be inviolably preserved."; the similar principle of the Delaware Constitution; Section 12 of the Virginia Declaration of Rights, of June 12, 1776,—("That the freedom of the press is one of the great bulwarks of liberty and can never be restrained but by despotic government."); and, finally, the important Delaware declaration (Articles 1 and 5) where Radishchev's cherished idea of the jury determining the facts and the law concerning libels is stated:

The press shall be free to every citizen who undertakes to examine the official conduct of men acting in a public capacity, and any citizen may print on any subject, being responsible for the abuse of that liberty. In prosecution for publications investigating the proceedings of officers, or where the matter published is proper for public information, the truth thereof may be given in evidence; and in all indictments for libels, the jury may determine the facts and the law, as in other cases.

Having described the United States as the champion of the freedoms of press and thought, both in its history and in its constitutions, Radishchev sought to show that these freedoms were also practiced

in American political life. To this end he quoted from John Dickinson, "who took part in the *change*."⁶

John Dickinson was the elected president of the Supreme Executive Council of Pennsylvania. Radishchev called him the "highest executive authority in the province" in order to bring him, in the eyes of the Russian reader, into sharp contrast with the Russian provincial governors, who were appointed by the Tsar, and who represented the person of the Tsar in the province. This lifted them high above any close contact with common mortals. Radishchev, having described John Dickinson in his administrative functions as the closest analogy to a Russian *gubernator*, told how Dickinson, having been scurrilously attacked in a series of sharp articles in the press, nevertheless "did not abhor" to answer with his printed *Vindication*, in which he "not only defended himself but also refuted his opponents, making them ashamed." This, wrote Radishchev, is a model worthy of imitation as to how accusations which are publicly made in a printed pamphlet should be avenged. "If, however," added Radishchev, "somebody grows furious against every printed line, he induces us to think that the printed story was true, and that the avenger is exactly as he was characterized in the printed 'sheets.'"

Radishchev not only admired the incarnation of natural law in the American Bill of Rights and the various declarations included in the constitutions of the particular states and endorsed American constitutional law, but he also idealized to a very high degree the criminal law of the United States. In his memorandum "On Legislation," which he wrote for the *Commission to Draft New Laws* after his return to Russia from Siberia in 1801,⁷ he emphasized that the Russian legislators who wish to establish new codes should follow the precedents of Greece (Solon, Lycurgus, and Pythagoras) and Rome and travel to countries where good laws were enacted in order to re-enact them in the younger countries.

There can be little doubt that what Catherine and her administration most vigorously abhorred in Radishchev's *Journey* were its political passages, especially its defense of the doctrine of the right of resistance and its vehement championing of the freedom of the

⁶The word *revolution* was not tolerated by the Tsarist censors from the time of Catherine the Great down to 1905. *Change* was the euphemism which was substituted for it.

⁷It was discovered only in 1916. Cf. *Golos minuvshago*, December, 1916, with an introduction of A. Popelnicki.

press. The attacks on serfdom and upon the sale of serfs like cattle at an auction were less painful to the régime than Radishchev's political ideas and particularly his enthusiasm for the new American Republic, which he so bluntly compared to autocratic Russia to the latter's disadvantage. It is significant that, although both Alexander I and Alexander II, in their more liberal periods, permitted the publication of Radishchev's other works, they both forbade the publication of the *Journey*. It had to be published abroad and smuggled into Russia or clandestinely copied and circulated until after the Revolution of 1905.

Nor, it may be added, has Radishchev been sufficiently appreciated under the Soviets. They have admired his materialism (or closeness to it), his hostility to the established Church, his unselfish and ardent defense of the emancipation of peasants, even his Western ideas of penal reform and his demands for an improvement of the judiciary, including criminal procedure. But his political ideas, so much influenced by the successful revolution of America, and particularly his Western constitutional ideas remain undesirable and tainted with suspicion.⁸

⁸In this connection, the book of Semennikov published in 1923, during the "liberal" period of the NEP, is much more objective than the book of Osherovich published in 1946, in which a detailed chapter is dedicated to Radishchev. In the latter all quotations of Radishchev from the American constitutions as well as the other items concerning his fight for freedom of the press are omitted. This cannot be regarded as incidental *lacunae* because the author shows a thoroughgoing acquaintance with the *Journey*, as well as with the other less important political essays of the author. Only the *Ode to Freedom* is quoted but not the more substantial and politically elaborated essays of Radishchev.

Law Does Not Wither Away in the Soviet Union

BY GEORGE C. GUINS

I

LENIN's doctrine of state and law is well known. He characterized the state as an apparatus of constraint serving the dominant class. The state and law are an expression of the will of the dominant class, and therefore are instruments of its domination. Aided by the law, the dominant class controls the people by a systematic application of violence.¹

Since, in the carrying out of Socialism, class structure of society is abolished, no dominant class, and consequently, no violence, can exist. Therefore, Lenin predicted the withering away of state and law. In conformity with this doctrine, the first Soviet Constitution, proclaimed in 1918, promised the abolition of state authority.²

The doctrine of the withering away of state and law after the establishment of Socialism, together with the abolition of the class struggle, dominated Soviet jurisprudence until the thirties. It had been supported by the most authoritative jurists, as well as the leading figures in Soviet circles: Goikhbarg, Krylenko, Pashukanis, Stuchka, and by many *dii minores*. The proletarian state was considered as a temporary instrument of oppression, necessary only for the period of organization of a socialist economy and the creation of a classless society. Krylenko, who had been Prosecutor and there-

¹Lenin, *State and Revolution* (in Russian) (*Collected Works*, vol. XXIV, p. 365). In conformity with the teacher, Krylenko—once a Commissar of Justice—characterized the court as “a weapon for the safeguarding of the interests of the ruling class. . . . A club is a primitive weapon, a rifle is a more efficient one, the most efficient is the court.” (Krylenko, *The Judiciary of the R.S.F.S.R.* (in Russian) 1923. Cited from Gsovski, *Soviet Civil Law*, 1948, p. 241.

²“The principal object of the Constitution of the R.S.F.S.R., which is adapted to the present transition period, consists in the establishment of a dictatorship over the urban and rural proletariat and the poorest peasantry, in the form of strong all-Russian Soviet power; the object of which is to secure complete suppression of the bourgeoisie, the abolition of exploitation of man by man, and the establishment of Socialism, under which there shall be neither class division nor state authority.” (Art. 9, ch. V of the Constitution of the R.S.F.S.R., July 10, 1918.)

after People's Commissar of Justice, denied the necessity for a Criminal Code in the future, and offered to leave a free choice of social defense measures to the O.G.P.U. Goikhbarg, author of the Family Code, asserted that there is no need for the state to interfere in marital affairs, and predicted that the family as a juridical entity would disappear. Pashukanis explained the appearance of the Civil Code in the Socialist state as a temporary concession to private trade; likewise, the temporary re-establishment of the commodity exchange and a monetary system. Consequently, he predicted that the Civil Code would be replaced with regulations of a purely technical character as soon as a Socialist economy could be realized.

All of these theories and ideas became a vital problem following the liquidation of N.E.P. and at the beginning of the five-year plans period. After the First Five-Year Plan, it was proclaimed that Socialism had won "finally and irrevocably"—the state and law were naturally expected to wither away in the immediate future. A witness states that:

In some places judges began to close their courts. Students of law schools passed resolutions expressing doubt whether their studies could possibly be of use any longer. In some provinces there was a movement in favor of closing down the local soviets, as organs of state authority were no longer needed. Some administrators began to nationalize domestic fowl and other odds and ends, to liquidate remnants of private economy.³

However, as early as 1929, Stalin began to warn that the withering away of the state was not on the agenda.⁴ He offered his own interpretation of the Marxian theory:

The anarchist theory of "blowing up" the State must not be confused with the Marxian theory of "breaking up," "smashing" the bourgeois state machine. Lenin . . . criticized and demolished anarchist theory, and proposed in its place the theory of a new state of proletarian dictatorship.⁵

Some years later, Stalin, in his speech on the results of the First Five-Year Plan, expressed his views with more emphasis:

The state will wither away, not through weakening state power, but through

³S. Dobrin, "Soviet Jurisprudence and Socialism," *Law Quarterly Review*, v. 52, pp. 420-21. A. Vyshinsky asserts the same thing: "To the students, the growing cadres, a nihilistic attitude toward Soviet law was suggested." ("On the Situation of the Front of Legal Theory," *Sotsialisticheskaya zakonnost*, 1937, 5, p. 31.)

⁴Stalin's address delivered at a session of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, April, 1929.

⁵Joseph Stalin, *Leninism, Selected Writings*, International Publishers, N. Y., 1942, p. 113.

the intensification of it to the point necessary to finish off the remnants of the dying classes and to organize defense against capitalist encirclement, which is as yet far from being, and will not soon be, destroyed.⁶

Thereafter attacks against legal nihilism began to appear on the pages of legal publications.⁷ The campaign became more intensive after the new Constitution of the U.S.S.R. was enforced. This Constitution was proclaimed by Stalin to be established "for the purpose of consolidating a social order desired by and beneficial to the working people," and for the "transformation of the dictatorship into a more flexible, and, consequently, a more powerful system of guidance of society by the state."⁸

Vyshinsky assumed the leading rôle in the campaign in favor of the "socialist law." He delivered several reports criticizing Pashukanis and his followers, and developed argumentation in defense of further strengthening of the Soviet state and law.⁹ "Why is stability of statutes essential?" asks Vyshinsky. "Because," he answers, "it reinforces the stability of the state order and state discipline, and multiplies tenfold the power of Socialism, mobilizing and directing it against forces hostile to them."¹⁰

Vyshinsky echoes Stalin, asserting that the Socialist state is necessary "in order to defend,"¹¹ to secure, and to develop relationships

⁶Quotation from the Report delivered by Stalin at the plenary session of the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, January 7, 1922. See *Leninism* (*supra*, note 5) p. 288. Quotation in the text is taken from the English translation of Vyshinsky's *The Law of the Soviet State*, N. Y., 1948, p. 62.

⁷See Komarov, "Osnovnye voprosy teorii sovetskogo prava," *Sovetskoe gosudarstvo*, 1934, No. 1, pp. 55-56.

⁸*Leninism*, pp. 338 and 394.

⁹Vyshinsky, "Voprosy prava i gosudarstva u K. Marksa," *Sov. Gos.*, 1938, No. 3; "Stalinskoe uchenie o sotsialisticheskome gosudarstve," *ibidem*, 1939, No. 2; "XVIII S'ezd V.K.P. (b) i zadachi nauki sotsialisticheskogo parava," *ibidem*, 1939, No. 3.

¹⁰Vyshinsky, *The Law of the Soviet State*, p. 51.

¹¹A circumstance especially emphasized by Stalin. He set forth many times the fact of "capitalist encirclement" and that bourgeois countries are awaiting an opportunity "to fall upon the Soviet Union and shatter it—or at least to undermine its power and weaken it." (*Leninism*, p. 83, 309 ff., 438 ff.) Also Molotov: "Under conditions of capitalist encirclement the problem is not the withering away of the communist state, but its capacity to repulse victoriously attacks of its class enemies. . . . Under present conditions the question which stands before us is not that of the withering away of the Soviet state, but that of strengthening its power in order to have a firm, powerful, socialist state, organized according to Bolshevik principles." ("The Twenty-First Anniversary of the October Revolution," *Bolshevik*, 1938, No. 21-22, pp. 34-35.)

and arrangements advantageous to the workers, and to annihilate completely capitalism and its remnants." For this purpose, he explains, the state needs "such state organs as the court and rules of procedure" just as much as it needs "administrative repression aided by extraordinary and exceptional measures and methods." "The law," Vyshinsky further comments, "not merely gives rights, it imposes obligations," and Soviet criminal law has to protect the fulfillment of duties; it requires "certain conduct, a certain relationship toward civil obligations." Soviet civil law is also necessary for the reason of inequality of rights; which is indispensable during the transition from Socialism to Communism. During this period of inequality the Socialist state has to correct the condition in some degree by establishing sanatoriums, recreation resorts, dispensaries, free training, pensions, relief measures, and so on. Thus, in addition to penal and civil codes, special branches of law regulating and augmenting the development of social welfare will comprise an essential part of legislation.¹²

Vyshinsky has also developed a theory about the withering away of state and law in the future:

Law—like the state—will wither away only in the highest phase of Communism, with the annihilation of capitalist encirclement, when all will learn to get along without special rules defining the conduct of people, under threat of punishment and with the aid of constraint; when people are so accustomed to observing the fundamental rules of community life that they will fulfill them without constraint of any sort. Until then, however, there is a necessity for general control, firm discipline in labor and in community life, and complete subordination of all the new society's work to a truly democratic state.¹³

The process of the state's withering away is, according to Vyshinsky, connected with the highest development of the state—the highest flowering of the new economy and the new productive forces. It presupposes a high level of Communist culture and great labor productivity.¹⁴

¹²Vyshinsky, *ibidem*, pp. 50-52.

¹³*Ibidem*, p. 52.

¹⁴*Ibidem*, p. 60. Also in a special article: "A general formula foretells the inevitability of the state's withering away 'under certain economic and cultural premises,' explains Vyshinsky; 'namely abolition of classes, liquidation of opposing differences between city and village, between intellectual and physical labor, an extensive development of culture, disappearance of the remnants of capitalism in men's consciousness, the custom of getting along without constraint (compulsory measures), and such a level of development of the productive forces that the abundance of material values will allow transition to the realization of the principle:

Thus, Stalin and his aide did not assert the impossibility of the withering away of the state and law. They maintained only that it was impossible to do away with law before the complete accomplishment of the Communist program. The withering away of state and law is only postponed *ad Calendas Graecas* and thus loses its practical significance. During the past decade it has not been discussed in the Soviet Union. However, the problem has not lost its theoretical interest. It is not clear whether Lenin's doctrine regarding state and law proved only to be impracticable or whether it is absolutely wrong. It has not been definitely solved whether a "truly democratic society" can ever exist without law, as Soviet jurists assert, and whether the existing Soviet system is capable of attaining in the slightest degree such a reorganization of social life that state and law become unnecessary.

II

The doctrine of the withering away of state and law is a consistent conclusion from the point of view of the Marxian theory of law. This theory, however, is erroneous. It is no less an extreme simplification of law than the simplification of the sociological problems implied in the Marxian theory of class struggle.

Law is not a simple superstructure above the totality of productive relationships forming society's economic structure. Not all legal relationships are rooted in the material conditions of life, and, consequently, law is not necessarily dependent upon the existing social-economic structure. A large society can exist only if it is organized in conformity with the psychology of its components. The larger it is, the more complex are the problems of its organization. There are differences of moral principles, religion, and language. There are, besides, some problems of purely organizational character: structure of the government, representation of local interests, elections, even administrative divisions of territory. Provisions of organizational character are an essential element of any legal system. Only a few of these organizational problems have a purely technical character and can be solved according to considerations of temporary expedience. A legislator meets constantly with problems of rights which are based on moral institutions, customs, religious differences, and which are sometimes deeply

"'From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs.'" (Vyshinsky, "Stalinskoe uchenie," [see *supra*, note 9], pp. 105-106.)

rooted in people's psychology because of their existence from time immemorial. Even a territorial division is sometimes connected, not so much with geographic and economic, as with historical and ethnographic conditions.

It is hardly possible that all existing differences will disappear completely, but even if a socialist state succeeds in eliminating all differences in morals and religions, and in exterminating all survivals of the past, many regulations of a legal character will none the less be necessary in order to organize the national economy and to establish an expedient and just correlation between different national groups.

It is no wonder, then, that in the Soviet legislation concerning different kinds of economic and administrative institutions, territorial divisions, and boundaries between different republics and autonomous regions there is an important and essential group of constitutional provisions.¹⁵

Some of the regulations relating to national autonomy, religion, and language have nothing in common with economic structure and class domination; there are others necessary for the organization of social life in general and, especially, of economic life. Both groups are necessary in a Communist state, particularly the latter because of its integral planning system.

The organization of social life has always been connected with the observance of different kinds of rituals. Rituals impress people either with their solemnity or with their antiquity—"The older, the more sacred" is a well known Russian saying. Rituals strengthen the significance of legal procedure. They enhance the rights and obligations whose origin is connected with their performance. They consolidate legal relations if performed at the moment of origin. They are also important when it is necessary to stress respect toward a certain rank or a certain organization.

England is a typical country of traditions and rituals. In China rituals or the so-called *li* compose an important foundation of its social order.¹⁶ Not every nation adheres to rituals in the same

¹⁵The legal character of some territorial problems is distinctly expressed in Art. 18 of the Soviet Constitution: "The territory of a Union Republic may not be altered without its consent." Cf. also Art. 8 of the same Constitution: "The land occupied by collective farms is secured to them . . . for an unlimited time—that is, in perpetuity."

¹⁶See G. C. Guins, *Ethical Problems of Contemporary China* (in Russian) Kharbin, 1927.

degree, but there is none which could eliminate them completely. Rituals have existed from olden times and they are inherent in human nature. Many rituals, therefore, have been sanctioned by law and even created by law, and comprise, on the level of organizational norms, a special group of legal regulations. The Soviet state makes increasing use of them. Having begun with the abolition of every solemnity in government customs, the Soviets are now turning to the reestablishment of many ceremonies and rituals. For example, that of officially receiving credentials from newly appointed ambassadors, of presenting rewards for meritorious action, and of the solemnization of marriage,¹⁷ of opening the session of the Supreme Soviet, of a sitting of the court,¹⁸ and others.

Rituals usually have nothing in common with a certain social and economic structure. Many of them prove to be too obsolete and, therefore, can be replaced or altered, but it would be unreasonable to eliminate them completely as an institution.¹⁹

A third group of juridical norms consists of the so-called declarations. When issued by the state's authorities they express obligations assumed by the state or by the government. To this group belong *praeambulae* attached to the constitutions or to international treaties, as well as declarations in the proper sense (manifestos of the pre-Revolutionary period) containing a program of future legislation. The Soviets have used this form on a large scale since the very beginning of the Soviet state.²⁰ Solemn and official declarations obligate the governments issuing them although they have no sanctions as forms of legal documents.

The provisions called above "organizational," "ritual," and "declarative" are interpreted at times, erroneously, of course, as purely

¹⁷Originally a very simple form of registration, marriage later became a more solemn procedure in the Soviet Union, the performance thereof being necessary for juridical significance. (*Ukaz* of July 8, 1947, Art. 40.) "Marriage ceremony has to be as attractive as possible, not a simple stamping of marriage documents." (*Komsomolskaya Pravda*, April, 1948.)

¹⁸The one-judge court in labor cases under the law of June 26, 1940, is criticized as being lacking in solemnity. (See Perlov, "K proektu ugolovno-processualnogo kodeksa," *Sov. Gos. i Pravo*, No. 9, 1947.)

¹⁹See G. C. Guins, *Law and Culture* (in Russian) Kharbin, 1938, pp. 70-74.

²⁰Declaration of the Rights of the Laboring and Exploited Peoples of July 10, 1918; Declaration of the Rights of the Peoples of Russia. Declaration on the Constitution of the Soviet Union dated July 13, 1923—to mention but a few. *The Law of the Five-Year Plan for Restoration and Development of the National Economy of the U.S.S.R. for 1946-50, has also a declarative character.*

technical rules:²¹ but the provisions of the civil and penal codes constitute the essential part of a legal system, and it was this part of law which was the chief object of discussion in the Soviet Union in connection with the problem of the withering away of law.

The necessity of civil law, in spite of "Socialism," became indispensable in the Soviet Union after the Constitution of 1936 confirmed the principle of inequality.²² If the state distributes bonuses and prizes, introduces a progressive scale of salaries and piece-work wages, establishes premiums for above quota production, recognizes the right on royalties, on compensation for inventions, property on lottery-loan bonds, etc., it is only consistent to acknowledge and to protect personal property rights and to permit conclusion of contracts and of inheritance. Not less consistent is the protection of existing property rights with the aid of penalties.

Thus, it became necessary to adopt civil and penal codes in the Soviet Union in spite of "Socialism." Not everything, however, in this field is a simple repetition of old principles and of the usual content of traditional legislation. Transition from a free economy to a planned one is characterized by a radical change of the customary ways of life, of human psychology, and of habitual incentives. There is in the Soviet Union a "Socialist property" which has an immeasurably higher significance than personal property.²³ It is necessary to protect "Socialist property," to enforce planned economy, and to create new incentives in order to encourage people in working out and supporting the socialization and planning system. All this demands the utmost development of complicated economic legislation connected with and supported by different kinds of rewards and penalties. The criminal code adopted in the Soviet Union has a special importance.²⁴

Another peculiarity of the Soviet Union's legal system is its

²¹Organizational provisions establish, to be sure, many important duties as far as citizens are concerned, and invest authorities with great power; rituals have a constitutive force and some rights cannot exist until rituals are performed; declarations having no legal character are merely promises. Thus, all three groups cannot be classified as technical rules.

²²"To each according to his work." (Art. 12 of the Constitution.)

²³"The basis of our system is public property, just as private property is the basis of capitalism." (Stalin, *Leninism*, p. 267.)

²⁴"The prophesy of the withering away of penal repressive organs was an attempt to leave us with fettered hands and to abandon our country to the mercy of saboteurs, terrorists, and diversionists." (Vyshinsky, "Osnovnye zadachi nauki sovetskogo sotsialisticheskogo prava," *Sovetskoe gosudarstvo*, No. 4, 1938.)

wealth of compulsory regulations. A system of free economy does not require such complicated legislation as a system of planned economy. As far as economic initiative can be placed at one's disposal and at one's own risk, regulations can be reduced to a minimum. The civil code limits sometimes freedom of action for the protection of interests of third persons, but it contains mostly optional provisions having an additional character when intentions of parties are not expressed (*jus dispositivum*). This is not the same as a planned or socialistic economy. Not only organization of economy in total, but also regulations of all kinds of transactions between enterprises and between enterprises and labor, regimentation of the whole process of production and distribution of raw materials and manufacture, of food and commodities, become in the Socialist state objects of a special legislation having a compulsory character.

In the Socialist state relations between man and state are much more complicated than in a free state where the latter, like a "night watchman," according to F. Lassale's expression, has only to protect but not interfere in the life of citizens. In the Socialist state, instead of the charitable activity of private institutions and of individuals from purely moral motives, the state itself has to provide citizens with assistance and security. Everyone has a right to welfare in exchange for his devoted service to the state. For this reason, legislation concerning rights and duties of the state and its citizens, and which regulates interrelations between them, is supposed again to expand much more in the Socialist state than in the so-called bourgeois state. For carrying out broad plans of social welfare, it is necessary to dispose of enormous appropriations, and therefore to have the right of collecting taxes and duties on the widest scale. It is also necessary to define who, and under what conditions, is entitled to the various kinds of public service and support, since human needs are limitless. All this requires special legislation.

This survey, though brief, is sufficient to show that state and law change essentially under Socialism and in a very serious manner, but do not wither away. Public law has to develop enormously at the expense of private law. The Socialist state, with its varied and complicated functions, requires a vast apparatus of power even if the consciousness and devotion of its citizens make repressions unnecessary. The state has its own duties and rights. Individual rights require a special protection, inasmuch as inequality is not abolished, but civil law becomes only a secondary branch of legislation in comparison with the highly developed administrative law.

Even though the Socialist system does not oppose social psychology and people are devoted to their socialistic state, if, moreover, the level of consciousness and culture is sufficiently high, and production satisfies the needs of the population, the legal order is still indispensable. It is possible to believe that the law of the Socialist state under these more favorable conditions will be more humane and liberal, but it will not wither away. If, on the contrary, Socialism does not correspond to the psychology of the nation, or if its economy is not efficient, then the penal system and regimentation of such a Socialist state may become exceedingly rigid and even ruthless.

III

During the last thirty years the Soviet state in action has proved absolutely the correctness of the general ideas stated above. The Soviet Union comprises sixteen constituents, the so-called Union Republics, and has, in addition to the Constitution of the U.S.S.R., sixteen separate constitutions, one for each of the Union Republics. Some of these Union Republics are in turn federative, and the present fifteen Autonomous Republics, members of the Union Republics, have their own constitutions. Seventeen Supreme Soviets are empowered to issue laws, and in order to understand Soviet legislation thoroughly, it is necessary to study official bulletins of the U.S.S.R. and of its sixteen Union Republics.

There are in the Soviet Union all branches of law and all kinds of legal provisions, but the most highly developed of all is public law. No other country has such a gigantic administrative machine nor so many ministries and departments, and nowhere is there so much regulation and regimentation of all phases of life. In the Soviet Union public law has been expanded in all its branches: constitutional, administrative, and financial; but what especially attracts the attention of those studying Soviet law and amazes them most is the exceedingly high development of criminal law in the Soviet Union. It is a perplexing phenomenon that the Soviets progressively increase penalties for the same crimes. Criminal law is best when it can prevent crime, and thus decrease the necessity for application of penalties. The normal trend in the development of criminal law is its gradual attenuation. If, on the contrary, a government increases the arsenal of penalties and replaces the mild ones with the most severe, it is evident that criminal activity has become more intensive.

Symptoms of this striking fact can be observed in the Soviet Union. Penalties have become more and more severe. In 1921, imprisonment was limited to a five year term. Only one year later this term was increased to ten years.²⁵ The minimal term of imprisonment was also doubled in 1930, from six months to one year. In 1937, penal servitude was established for some kinds of crimes up to twenty-five years.

Not only imprisonment and penal servitude but the application of the death sentence by shooting was increased in 1932, fifteen years after the Revolution. The *ukaz* of August 7, 1932, directed against counter-Revolutionary actions,²⁶ is known as one of the most severe measures of social defense. In 1947, instead of decreasing penalties established fifteen years earlier, a new *ukaz* of June 4, 1947, expanded application of the previously established penalties.²⁷ It is hardly possible to interpret these measures otherwise than as evidence of the permanent resistance on the part of the population to the policy of the Soviet government and of the inefficacy of the Soviet penal system. As illustration we refer to a special law punishing predatory slaughtering of cattle. Since 1930, when a special law punishing this crime was first issued, not only was there no decreasing of penalties for slaughtering of cattle, but even the application of this law was expanded through the aid of interpretation.²⁸

²⁵This term was confirmed by the Fundamental Principles of the Criminal Legislation of the U.S.S.R. and Constituent republics, enforced by the Resolution of the 11th Conference of the Tsik of the U.S.S.R., October 31, 1924 (*Coll. Laws USSR*, 1924, No. 24). This act is still formally in force.

²⁶*Ukaz* on the Protection of the Property of State Enterprises, Collective Farms, and Cooperatives, and the Strengthening of Public (Socialist) Ownership. (*USSR Laws*, 1932, text 360.) Capital punishment was recently replaced in peacetime by confinement in a camp of correctional labor for a period of 25 years. (*Ukaz* of May 26, 1947.) On January 12, 1950, capital punishment was restored for treason, espionage, and diversionist acts. (*Izvestia*, January 3, 1950.)

²⁷*Ukaz* of June 4, 1947, concerning the Increased Protection of Government and Public Property. "... Although the death penalty is at present excluded, there are now even broader possibilities of applying severe penalties for any mishandling of property of the collective farms." (See Gsovski, *Soviet Civil Law*, Ann Arbor, 1948, p. 731.)

²⁸In 1942 a ruling of the Supreme Court instructed the courts to apply by analogy the law of January 20, 1930, incorporated in the Criminal Code as Art. 79, even in the case of fraudulent slaughter of offspring in contradiction to the government's plans for breeding of cattle. A new law was also issued and incorporated as Art. 793-4 of the Criminal Code establishing penalties for "illegal slaughter of horses

It is obvious that some crimes proceed from the Soviet system itself. Thus, prohibition of unrestricted departure for foreign countries gave birth to a new profession of guides. Thence, a special law punishing "assistance in illegal crossing of the state's boundaries, given by a professional guide or by officials."²⁹ Misprision of committed crimes or of preparation for committing a crime entails punishment, and people are taught from their childhood that reporting on one another is praiseworthy. But this reporting not infrequently becomes denunciation which is often pure slander.³⁰

There are some articles in the Criminal Code of the R.S.F.S.R. which clearly show that prostitution has not become extinct, that there are cases of compulsion of minors and adults to practice prostitution, and that, in 1935, it became necessary to issue new penal provisions for prosecuting this crime.³¹ Criminal sociology cannot explain this phenomenon unless by pauperism, which apparently has not been liquidated by the Soviet system. For the same reason, bribery has not been eliminated, abortions and murder of newly born children are practiced.³²

A Soviet textbook also discusses some crimes which were impossible in Russia before the Revolution. For example, an impostor pretending to be a coroner conducts an inquest, at which he steals several objects. This would have been absolutely impossible during the Tsar's régime, when coroners were officials having a special uniform and were well known to the people, and when the procedure of an inquest was accompanied by some formality which guaranteed the population against such abuses. Another example in the same

without the authorization of the supervising veterinary authorities, the intentional maiming of horses or any malicious act which results in the loss of a horse or renders it unfit for use."

²⁹Art. 59 of the Crim. Code.

³⁰Reporting for profit was also practiced; the person making the report was often able to obtain the housing of the person about whom he had made the report. A certain P—, for a purely personal motive, falsely accused a girl of the same village of having made anti-Soviet statements, and induced two other girls, one still a minor and the other illiterate, to sign his statement. (Both examples from Goliakov, *Ugolovnoe pravo*, Textbook, Moscow, 1947, p. 222.)

³¹Law of Nov. 25, 1935. See Art. 73^a (amend. of 1936) and Art. 155 of the Criminal Code.

³²John Hazard, "Drafting New Soviet Codes of Law," *American Slavic and East-European Review*, February, 1948, tells of a Soviet project of increasing penalties for the punishment of mothers who murder their newly born children. Unfortunately, the author limits himself to the simple information and does not explain why the described crime took place and why it is necessary to increase the penalty.

text-book³³ relates how a person posed as an artist in order to take advantage of the privileges granted to this profession. Before the Revolution there were no artists or any other persons of the liberal professions who enjoyed such privileges as now exist in the Soviet Union.

The foregoing gives us sufficient ground to assert that the Soviet system gives rise to some specific crimes originating in the new conditions of life, and from new circumstances created by the system itself. But what is the most important is that the new legal order begets resistance and counter-action on the part of farmers and other groups of the population dissatisfied by the new system.³⁴ This resistance, qualified as counter-revolutionary action, is severely prosecuted and punished. But, not being exterminated, despite persecution, it requires further increasing of penalties, or the extending of existing penalties by means of their application by analogy.³⁵

The study of Soviet law makes evident that the Soviet system not only does not create conditions favorable for the withering away of state and law, but that on the contrary, it strengthens the state and extends enormously legal restrictions and criminal law.³⁶

From a theoretical point of view, as it was explained above (Section II), it is improbable that a socialist state with a centralized planned economy can do away with law. The Soviet state, pretend-

³³Goliakov, *op. cit.*, pp. 208-209.

³⁴"The origin of crime—the struggle of the isolated individual against dominant relationships—like the origin of law is not purely arbitrary. On the contrary, crime is rooted in the same conditions as is the governing power existing at the time." (Marx and Engels (Russ. Edition), vol. IV, p. 312. Quoted by Vyshinsky, *The Law of the Soviet State*, p. 14.)

³⁵Application of criminal law by analogy (Art. 16, Crim. Code) is one of the peculiarities of the Soviet system, violating one of the oldest principles *nullum crimen, nulla poena sine lege*. Analogy is permitted if there is similarity in kind and in importance of an act. Authors accepting this violation of fundamental principle of law indulgently (cf. H. Berman, "Principles of Soviet Criminal Law." *Yale Law Journal*, v. 56, 1947, pp. 804, 810) ignore the fact that the "importance" of an act is always defined according to the government's views. (See *supra*, note 28 and comments to Art. 78, 166, etc. of the Penal Code, ed. 1947, in Russian.)

³⁶Soviet jurists assert that "in the social order of the U.S.S.R. there are no conditions which could give birth to criminality. The latter is the result of capitalist encirclement and survivals of capitalism in the consciousness of backward people." (Cf. V. M. Chkhikvadze, "Sovetskii sud—borba za preodolenie perezhitkov kapitalizma," *Sov. gos. i pravo*, No. 2, 1949.) Such an explanation is not in agreement with the content of Soviet laws which give sufficient evidence that many crimes have their origin in conditions created by the Soviet system.

ing to be Socialist, demonstrates this in the most striking manner. It changes the character of law but does not abolish it. The state becomes more exacting, the legal order more restrictive, and citizens' rights more relative.

IV

The Marxian doctrine of law as a superstructure above the social and economic relationships is wrong; its predictions on the withering away of state and law are inaccurate, but not entirely arbitrary. In fact, there are in every legal system certain elements which are closely connected with the social relationships of a certain time, not especially economic or social conditions, but cultural and political as well, and international in particular. Legal provisions of this kind are transitory and changeable, and this is the part which can be *mutatis mutandis* called a "superstructure," but there are, besides, many other elements in law of an amazing longevity, reflecting peculiarities of human psychology in general or being in response to the constant needs of social life. Provisions regulating relations between parents and children, between husband and wife, depend upon religious and cultural traditions no less than on economic and social. Provisions of Roman law concerning forms of securing and concluding contracts or liabilities and compensation for damage and injuries can be adopted by the Socialist state no less than by a bourgeois state. Murder, rape, and many other crimes against the life, health, and liberty of a person have existed in various epochs under various social and economic structures.

There are, thus, some parts of law which can and must wither away and others which are more stable and even remain immutable during millennia. There are some parts of law which have class character, and others which are adapted to the needs of social life independently of class. It is, therefore, indisputable that some parts of law may wither away, some have to be replaced or amended, but many legal principles have every chance to survive our turbulent epoch as they have survived the darkest times of the Middle Ages.

The Soviet system of law contains many regulations of a purely class character. From the very beginning of the Bolshevik Revolution, the Soviets started to give special privileges to some groups of the population ³⁷ and, on the other hand, to strengthen repres-

³⁷Art. 156, 166, 171 of the Civ. Code established privileges such as housing and

sions against non-privileged groups.³⁸ For a long time court decisions rendered in the Soviet Union referred to the social status of the persons concerned. The personnel of the courts (judges and assessors) still consists mostly of Communists, i.e. workers and peasants.³⁹

Inequality connected with this kind of class privilege must certainly be abolished. The Soviet State itself originates laws which far exceed pre-Revolutionary law in injustice and it considers this law as transient. This is an example of transient law which has to wither away. But there is another much more important process of withering away of law, depending not on the social structure but on moral progress *par excellence*. Criminal law is especially subject to this process. Its ideal, as explained above, is to make itself unnecessary. Deterring or reeducating, the law inculcates in the people moral discipline and teaches them a loyal and sociable conduct. Criminal law must prevent rather than punish crimes, and it is most efficient when it becomes unnecessary, and not when it has to be replaced by a still more severe system of penalties, as is really the case in the Soviet Union.⁴⁰

If a criminal code becomes milder, it is the sign that coercion in general becomes less, if at all, necessary. It bears evidence that people have reached a new and higher level of self-discipline and

legal force of contracts. Art. 5 of the Introductory Regulations to the Civil Code provided special privileges in application of legal provisions in regard to working people.

³⁸"Slaughter of one's own animals under a certain age entailed a fine for a non-kulak but for a kulak it entailed confiscation of all his animals and implements, withdrawal of the land he used, and two years imprisonment, with or without exile." (*USSR Laws*, 1930, text 66, Sec. 1; 1931, Text 474.) The same for failure to pay taxes on the date due. (See Gsovski, *op. cit.*, p. 712.)

³⁹"The court of the State of proletarian dictatorship is the court of the working class. . . ." (See Gsovski, *op. cit.*, p. 249ff.) "The judiciary is an organ of state power and therefore cannot be outside of politics." (J. Towster, *Political Power in the USSR*, Ann Arbor, 1948, p. 304.)

⁴⁰The facts of the continually increasing penalties by Soviet legislation contradict decisively the statement of H. Berman that "Socialist Law which protects and educates morality . . . helps the Soviet state to inculcate in the peoples of the USSR discipline and self-discipline." (Harold J. Berman, "The Challenge of Soviet Law," *Harvard Law Review*, v. 62, no. 2 and 3, 1948, p. 238.) Soviet legislation demonstrates on the contrary that discipline in the Soviet Union is based on compulsion and terror rather than on "educational morality."

moral culture. The character of the state then changes, relations between man and state can be based on conscientiousness on one side and simple management on the other.

There are consequently some processes which give promise of the withering away of law, if not in total at least in part. In studying these processes one discovers in what the withering away of law may consist.

Since the early infancy of human society, correlation between the individual and the social authorities has been one of the most serious problems. Society needs coercion. The individual requires freedom. To these double trends corresponds dichotomy of private and public law. The public law is based on subordination. It recognizes duties rather than rights. Even those who have rights have them for the sake of the common interest, and they have to exercise their rights as a function of their civil duties. He who has the right to prosecute must do it. He who has the right to give orders and to punish is obliged to do so when it is necessary. Public right is practically a duty. Private law, on the contrary, gives freedom. If public law cultivates consciousness of duty, private law educates consciousness of right, determines the meaning of freedom to act or not to act, to demand or to forgive, to dispose of one's fortune, of one's energy and capacities at one's own discretion. Provisions of civil law are mostly optional; it is possible to evade them if such an intention is flatly expressed. There are but few restrictive provisions of civil law which limit freedom in the interest of the third person or of the public welfare, but the parties are free to enter or to refrain from entering into legal relations governed by compulsory provisions.

The foundations of civil law were laid by the Romans, and when the study of Roman law was restored in the eleventh century, it functioned as a school where the European nations were educated in a psychology of individualism and self-determination. The citizens of Western nations, accustomed to having imprescriptible private rights carried over this conception to public law as being one of innate individual rights. Accustomed to self-determination in their family life and economic activity, they believed in the possibility of organizing their social life independently of the state and without its interference. The development of state and law, which Marxists used to call "the withering away," is in fact only a

process of limiting the coercive power of the State in favor of the increasing freedom of citizens.

The evolution of law in the West comprised the establishment of firm and effective guarantees of freedom, the recognition of subjective public rights,⁴¹ and the development of self-government. All these achievements of the legal order give the impression that the state, as an organization disposing of coercive force, demanding obedience, and laying duties upon its subjects, is fading and that law, as a system of regimentation, is withering away. In fact, it is only the evolution of state and law, in conformity with the education of citizens in discipline, which opens up the possibility of widening their freedoms and self-determination and promises the replacing of subordination as a basic trend of law by coordination. In the light of this development it is possible to discern outlines of a new system of law and a new state of the future—the next stage of our civilization.⁴²

The development of the Soviet state and law does not correspond to the tendencies just described. Instead of weakening, Soviet public law is constantly growing stronger; instead of the strengthening of individual rights, the duties of citizens are becoming emphasized. Dependence upon the state is becoming stronger than it ever was because of the concentration of the whole economy in the hands of the state, and because even cultural activity is submitted to the state's control.

In the meantime, in the United States and in other really democratic countries, the state's coercive power is being more and more restrained, and individuals receive more and more freedom, protected not only by the state but also by their own organizations. One may object, referring to the economic legislation of the United States and the United Kingdom since the first World War to effectuate economic regulations. However, if this kind of legislation is

⁴¹G. J. Jellinek, *System der subjectiven oeffentlichen Rechte*, 1892.—The right to demand cancelling of all orders of the state if they violate freedoms; the right to judiciary and administrative assistance; and the right of participating in political activity. For a while this doctrine was not only accepted by the Soviet administration law, but even completed with a right of using State's property. (See Kobalevsky, *Sov. Admin. Law*, Kharkov, 1928, p. 12.)

⁴²Cf. C. G. Guins, *On the Way to the State of the Future* (From Liberalism to Solidarism), in Russian, Kharbin, 1930. Also his *New Ideas in Law* (in Russian), vol. I, Kharbin, 1931, § 24; vol. II, 1932, § 50.

not temporary, it nevertheless consists rather of limitations than of forcible constraints. Nationalizations of some branches of industry limit the sphere of free economy, but as far as they are enforced they do not constrain or restrict. The democratic freedoms as well as rights of organized labor remain untouched, and the tendency of a further attenuation of the legal system is not blocked. In spite of the new trends of regulative character and increasing interference of the state in the sphere of national economy, the people are and will be citizens, not subjects.

The great democracies, but not the Soviet Union, can be proud of their progress in the field of law.

Souvenir of a Petrograd Evening

BY ALEXANDRA FREDERICKS

LIFE began late at the Wandering Dog, so we went first to a performance at the Mikhailovsky Theatre. I cannot recall what the play was but retain the association in my mind of the Mikhailovsky with the urbanities of Molière; probably the play was his. Anyway it was the Mikhailovsky with its atmosphere of warmth and expectancy, its brilliant audience, and its martinet-trained flunkies, one outside or inside every door. That, however, faded with the later impressions of the night. From the theater a few short steps took us to the entrance of the Wandering Dog, the entrance to a sort of cellar below the cold and slush of the square.

My first look disclosed a long dim hall on both sides of which were improvised coat rooms and laughing check girls trying to bring order out of chaos. It was cluttered with wet fur coats lying on the floor. People were everywhere, choking the entrance, good-humoredly chatting, jostling one another, squatting on the heaps of furs, but more generally active in attempts to penetrate the inner rooms. They seemed an oddly assorted lot. Philistines were few, for the management discouraged them, and if any such appeared they never got to the center of interest nor probably ever tried again. This Bohemian sea coast had a snobbery of its own. I believe that no high entrance fee or cover charge was asked but would have been paid gaily had it been demanded. Financial gain was the least thing in mind. At that place and time, there were eager patrons to support readily and sometimes extravagantly such an enterprise. Cultivated enjoyment was their sole aim.

Behind us the door opened to admit a gust of fresh cold air and the figure of a woman wrapped in furs, from which rose a head of great serious beauty. There was a gasp of appreciation for the unique quality of Karsavina. There was perhaps also a touch of anticipation, for it was known that sometimes she danced here superbly costumed, on magnificent rugs loaned by collectors for the occasion, but that was for a small company of invited guests and not for an ordinary evening like this.

A slight, agile man of about forty emerged from the inside room and stood beside the crazed mirror which partly reflected but more distorted the lively movements of the crowd. He was informally

dressed in a soft shirt with a wide silk ribbon around his neck in the style of the Romantic painters. Everyone started to shout "Boris, Boris!" but his only answer was an enigmatic smile and his characteristic gesture of raising thin nervous hands high about his head. Then he retreated with quick steps.

Boris Pronin, proprietor and impresario of the Wandering Dog, deserves a detailed article to himself. May these faulty memories inspire a hand more competent! His taste was well nigh perfect. He was intelligent and full of imagination, his judgment informed and immediate, his modesty made each one his friend. Possessing many gifts himself he recognized them enthusiastically in others. But I suspect his success to have been achieved principally by his ability to hold people together and so make them do their best.

His public was made up of artists and devoted lovers of the arts, mostly young, and their interest was intense. They knew well what they liked and their decisions on the merits or deficiencies of the many beginners who first displayed their artistic or intellectual wares at the Wandering Dog were surprisingly confirmed by time. Few who did not deserve it received applause.

Soon we were summoned to the first of the two inner rooms and seated at a long table beside others already established. I wanted to see everything and everybody at once but that was difficult in the candle light and thick tobacco smoke. I was unable to make out the decoration or the furnishing of the room—only the plain wood tables, the rush-seated chairs, and the low ceiling. The audience was grouped in a rough circle about a small open space left for those who would recite. Under a chandelier of wood crowned with candles, the crowd was bizarre. Elegantly dressed ladies rubbed elbows with uniforms or with young fellows whose long hair was dyed yellow and whose faces were studiously made up to accentuate their pallor. One young man had an airplane painted on his forehead.

Next to me sat two boys who reminded me of the drawings of Aubrey Beardsley, then so fashionable, and of course this was precisely what they intended. Georgi Ivanov with his long dark hair and plucked-chicken neck and Georgi Adamovich were newcomers to the group of poets around the then famous Kuzmin.

Moushka, the real wandering dog, a little bitch of uncertain breed and the color of a long suffering doormat, was under the feet of everybody.

Across the table I now recognized the dandy Kuzmin, a small delicate little man who parted his hair in the back and brushed it

forward to end in hornlike curls in order to cover a disproportionately large cranium. I did not understand his protuberant llama eyes and his exotic color until one of the boys whispered that "Michenka," whom he much admired, was of French provincial derivation, probably tropical. Kuzmin sat with his small hands clasped before him like an operatic soprano and punctuated his frequent witticisms with little giggles. I had read with delight his carefully polished verses mannered after the eighteenth century but having a peculiar Russian flavor like those pastoral figures painted by peasants on the walls of some manor house deep in the country. His nicety of style made him the example for many young followers now forgotten.

Kuzmin admired the graphic talent of Chodowieski and his own style had something of the Pole's exactitude. Occasionally his verses reflected another obsession, that with the Italian *Commedia dell'Arte*. His disciples imitated him in the lisping sing-song of their verses; their nearly *castrato* voices were rather repellent to my ears. Most of their poems ended with a kind of "dying fall" in a rhetorical or wistful question which no doubt gently suggested the end of their epoch.

Against the wall on which she leaned, the angular and romantic figure of Anna Achmatova sheathed in a tight black gown was startling, the head nothing but profile. Her simple sensitive lyrics were then already appreciated for their disciplined expression of personal tragedy. I do not know whether her reputation was overshadowed or increased by that of her husband Gumilev but it was assured. He sat near her, the unconscious classicist who was guiltless of classical clichés but classical no less in his refinement of expression and the battle with words which availed him so well in his translation into Russian of Gautier's *Emaux et Camées*.

The chatter quieted as it became evident that the stars were about to shine. A big stout man with oiled hair, white peasant shirt, and boots entered from the interior room leading by his hand a younger man with blue eyes, blond curls, and eager face. This was Kluev introducing Essenin. The elder soon began to read in a colorless voice without particular rhythm or emphasis. He was a skillful follower of Koltzov, the early nineteenth century poet whose works to English ears are so reminiscent of Robert Burns and to Americans may suggest the simpler unpolitical poems of Whittier. The similarity of titles among the three is sometimes striking. It is unlikely, however, that Koltzov had ever heard of either as they were little known in Russia. Kluev did not, like Koltzov, rely for

his words and rhythms on church language or on peasant songs. He was conscientious, honest, and direct, and commanded a respectful but not excited response. All eyes were on the younger man, also in peasant dress, for there were already interesting reports of his talent.

In a high-pitched voice Essenin read diffidently his poems of peasant life, of his village, and of the melancholy Russian land. They were without affectation, moving, and tender. One had to listen carefully to catch his words. I liked him and his poetry and could scarcely believe when later we heard that he had written in his own blood a poem to a friend and then had taken his life. His recital ended the arranged program for the evening. There was applause again, genuine but not vociferous, and general conversation was resuming when a tall, ungainly figure emerged from the tobacco smoke. A young man, immense and awkward, had dragged himself to his feet and was flinging long arms and monstrous hands about like the arms of a windmill. He was dressed with what seemed an assertive and intentional vulgarity which prepared us for his outburst. He shouted defiance, abuse, and damnation to all and sundry. After the intellectuals' pinwheels and roman candles he exploded like a bomb. Vladimir Mayakovsky! He was already known as one of the authors of "A Slap on the Jaw of the Public" and that much of him and his quality had been revealed. As in prophetic warning he proclaimed the emptiness of all we knew and the dawn of a disastrous day. There was none, I think, who questioned his sincerity or failed to realize his power. Much later in the quiet of a bare, cold tenement I read him and understood his reputation as *the* poet of the Revolution. Also I met him and discovered beneath the bristles of his wild genius the kind and childish heart of a giant.

Mayakovsky was the climax of that evening's crowded experience from which I went home with my eyes smarting, my body exhausted, and my mind snapping like those machine guns to which we were so soon to become accustomed. Mayakovsky! He too, like Essenin, heart broken but still bold, hurried to meet whatever, if any, God he knew.

National Feudalism in Muscovy

BY VALENTINE TSCHEBOTARIOFF-BILL

WHEN we speak of the Middle Ages of Europe, we have a clearly perceptible historical period in mind. We mean those centuries from the fall of the Roman Empire to the advent of the Renaissance. We also have a clear conception of the principal features which made Europe medieval during those centuries and of the way the Middle Ages came to an end.

But to define the Middle Ages of Russia is a much more complex and difficult task. It is impossible to state the advent of Russia's Middle Ages, to define its explicit features, and least of all, to determine the time of its disappearance with the same degree of exactitude as in the case of Europe. And yet, few problems in Russia's history are as important for an understanding of the peculiarities of Russia's growth as the question of Russian medievalism and its deviations from its European counterpart.

The emergence of medieval practices, ways, and features occurred in Russia at a later date than in Europe. During the first phase of Russian history, the days of the Principality of Kiev from the ninth to the twelfth centuries, the Russians engaged in trade, their towns grew and prospered, and the monetary turnover was considerable, while those same centuries brought, in Europe, the heyday of feudalism.

It was in the second stage of Russia's growth, in the days of the Tartar yoke, in the thirteenth, fourteenth, and early fifteenth centuries, that the cultural achievements of the preceding phase were lost, that feudal traits become apparent in Russia. We find the same preoccupation with religion, the same emphasis on agriculture as in Europe, the same political decentralization and separatism.

Yet, an important feature of European medievalism is still missing in Russia. There is, as yet, no serfdom. The population is restless, moving to and fro, slowly shifting and drawing toward Moscow, the rising center of unification.

It is in the third phase of Russia's growth, in the late fifteenth and in the sixteenth centuries, when Moscow achieves supremacy and forms the centralized state of Muscovy, that Russian medievalism comes most strikingly to the fore.

The political unification of Russia under Moscow's leadership

developed as a result of Tartar oppression. The Russians drew together, following Moscow's lead, in order to overthrow the Tartar yoke. And the formation of the state of Muscovy was not a process of fundamental internal changes, but rather of territorial growth, concentration, and union to meet and destroy the external pressure of a foreign yoke. Muscovy became national in extent, but remained feudal in spirit. While Reason was opening new horizons to the Western mind and Money was transforming the structure of European society, the state of Muscovy remained basically an enlarged version of a feudal unit, where Faith reigned supreme and where Land was still the principal productive form of wealth and the main factor determining the structure of society.

This feudalism, retained and preserved within a national framework, produced in Muscovy peculiarly contrasting features. It produced many elements of social cohesion and harmony. But far more numerous and dangerous were the forces of discord and disruption which it brought to the fore.

A large measure of stability and a solid base of permanency in the social structure of Muscovy was provided by the Russian church. In contrast to the Western church, the Russian ecclesiastical power never aspired to political domination over the state. Ever since the downfall of the Principality of Kiev, so greatly promoted by the discord among the various members of the ruling dynasty, the Russian church strove to eliminate dissent and feuds among the Russian princes and to further the formation of a centralized state. This fusion of religious and national elements, although Byzantine in origin, was greatly promoted by the Tartar yoke, since the struggle against these unbelieving and oppressive invaders was as much a religious crusade as it was a patriotic movement of liberation. So then, the political unification of Russia was promoted by spiritual and religious forces, and not by material factors, such as money, economy, or technical progress, as in Europe. The harmony between the state of Muscovy and the Russian church stands in sharp contrast to the lengthy conflict between the Western church, which claimed political as well as spiritual domination over the entire Western world, and the growing spirit of nationalism in Europe.

Due to the dominant rôle of the church, Muscovite life was permeated by religion in such a manner that social disparities tended to be softened and the component parts of Muscovite society to be drawn into a cohesive, uniform entity.

In town and country, the houses of high and low were decorated

with a profusion of ikons, secular ornaments such as mirrors or pictures being barred by the church. The numerous and frequently lengthy fasting periods were strictly observed by all and thus tended to reduce the disparity between the eating habits of the rich and of the poor. But the most spectacular religious influence working for social cohesion was the position of beggars in Muscovy. They were not considered a social evil, but a necessary component group of society, a group which facilitated spiritual salvation. For the beggar was considered the best petitioner before God for his benefactor. Hence it was as important to give charity as it was to receive it, and the distribution of alms was an important task performed by all who had anything to give.

But social unity did not end there. Common understanding was not only present between the rich and the poor, but also between one generation and the next. The family was a powerful, dominant force. As an individual taken by himself, a person had no social value. It was the place into which he was born that determined his position in society since birth and family standing was considered the direct expression of the will of God, placing each individual into a given and immutable position in society.

The Muscovite family was organized in a strict, patriarchal pattern. The father, the master of the house, enjoyed unlimited power and authority over all members of his household. He did much more than merely direct and supervise their economic activities. The most interesting feature of his position was that he was the teacher, the educator, of the family unit. Yet education in Muscovy was very different from what is currently understood by the term. Reading and writing was merely a technique necessary for certain professions, and not a tool of general intellectual development. People were not taught how to think, since the church considered it a sin to try to solve the mysteries of the world or to develop critical, independent judgment and opinions. What did matter in Muscovite education were the precepts of how to live like a good Christian. Humility, charity, and brotherly love were some of the virtues which the head of the family, the father, was supposed to exhibit before his sons, through the example of his behavior rather than through formal hours of tutoring and instruction. "A wise man was a man who did a lot of good, not one who knew a lot. . . ."¹ Since no critical appraisal entered into this educational

¹V. O. Kliuchevsky, "Dva vospitaniya" in *Ocherki i rechi*.

scheme, there was little distinction between the views, habits, and tastes of one generation and another. The conflict between fathers and sons, so acute at a later stage of Russian history, did not yet exist in ancient Muscovy.

Yet side by side with these elements of social cohesion there existed dangerous disruptive forces of political tension and economic disharmony in Muscovy. The problem was particularly acute in the field of state organization. In the days of Russian disunity and decentralization under the Tartars, the size and importance of independent sovereign territories had greatly varied. When Moscow succeeded in bringing all these multifarious units under its power, the formerly independent princes became the servitors, the boyars, of the Grand Prince and later Tsar of Muscovy—the core of an administrative state officialdom. They all flocked to Moscow, each demanding from their new master administrative positions corresponding to the relative size and importance of the territory which they had formerly called their own.

The right to such demands was claimed not only by the first generation of princely boyars, who remembered life as independent rulers, but also by their descendants. The boyars worked out an elaborate hierarchy of noble families, known as *miestnichestvo*, a system where everybody had his rightful, inalienable place. It was impossible for a boyar whose ancestors had ruled a small territory to obtain a position at the court of Moscow more important than the office held by a boyar whose ancestors had reigned over a larger section of the Russian land.

Arguments based on this system concerned not only matters as important as the assumption of official positions. In daily contacts at the court of Moscow, the boyars continuously quarreled with each other whenever the most trivial question of their relative individual importance arose.

But the system of *miestnichestvo* not only provided a battle ground for the boyars among themselves; it also gave rise to serious friction between the boyars and the Tsar. For the system imposed burdensome limitations on the supreme power of the Tsar. It prevented him from selecting his advisers, helpers, and administrators according to his own free choice, since the office assigned to an individual boyar was determined by his birth and hereditary position, and not by his talents, ability, and usefulness to the state.

At the root of this conflict lay the fact that Russia had grown to the size of a large national state while preserving her feudal way of

life and her medieval mentality. It was this disparity between national form and feudal contents which gave rise to such sharp conflicts in the state structure of Muscovy. While in Europe the Renaissance released a host of new intellectual forces and material energies, all progressive influences remained absent in Russia. While in Europe monetary wealth began to loosen the rigid class division of the feudal caste system, in Russia there was nothing to replace feudal concepts and to eradicate the traits of medievalism established in preceding centuries.

It was because the boyars were clinging to the past that they established the system of *miestnichestvo*, intended to reproduce as closely as possible conditions of an age gone by at the contemporary court of Muscovy. They grafted vestiges of ancient separatism upon the new centralism of Moscow. The boyars, absorbed in the maintenance of their scaled and graded system, paid far more attention to the rigid observance of this system than to current affairs of state, administration, and policy.

But the Tsar himself was also affected by the lack of novel concepts and by the absence of suitable tools adapted to the change from feudal decentralization to national unification. There was no merchant class to speak of at the time of the formation of the Muscovite state,—a merchant class which could have served the Tsar as a useful ally against the outmoded conservatism of the boyars, as it served the monarchs of European states against the traditional privileges of the feudal aristocracy. In matters of domestic administration, the Tsar depended on the services of the boyars. And as much as he disliked the system of *miestnichestvo*, the impasse of the situation seemed insoluble to men steeped in the spirit of tradition and unable to shed customs of centuries gone by.

For over a century the boyars used the weapon of *miestnichestvo* against the Tsar. When at last Ivan the Terrible struck back with the instrument of *oprichnina*, this counterweapon, too, proved a weird, rigid, clumsy implement forged in the arsenal of the past, a product of medieval mentality. Both *miestnichestvo* and *oprichnina* were based on the concept of land tenure. The hierarchy of the boyars was scaled and fixed in terms of comparative sizes of territories, and Ivan the Terrible's decree of *oprichnina* was equally dependent on the idea of land holding. For it converted vast tracts of territory, principally in the central regions of Muscovy—stronghold of boyardom—into a huge estate privately owned by the Tsar,

and conferred fiefs upon the dispossessed and dislodged boyars along distant frontier regions of Muscovy.

The Tsar's weapon was by far the more effective of the two. The boyars' backs were broken. Ivan the Terrible could claim a decisive victory over the last vestiges of particularism in his domain. But a demolition order alone was not enough to rebuild and reorganize society or to produce a more productive and efficient community. Ivan's creation had to pass a double test to prove its worth—on the battlefield and in the village, in warfare and in agriculture. If the institution of *oprichnina* was not followed by an increase in the efficiency of Muscovy's army and by an increase in the productivity of Muscovy's agriculture, it was bound to be doomed to failure.

Although a few standing regiments entered into the composition of Muscovy's army, the largest portion of the military units was based on land holdings, in very much the same fashion as the feudal defenses had been organized in medieval Europe. The enemies Muscovy had to guard against stretched in a vast semicircle along her frontiers—Sweden in the Northwest, Poland-Lithuania in the West, and remnants of the Tartar horde in the South and Southeast. And Muscovy used the land along the threatened frontiers for the settlement of a landed militia, which tilled the soil in times of peace and took up arms in times of war.

The land distributed among the military servitors, who were known as *dvoriane* (from the word *dvor*, court or household), remained the property of the state. Like the European fief, land tenure was conditional and temporary, depending in each individual case on the duration of military service.

Centuries of battles with the Tartars had left their mark on Muscovy's art of war. Like the Tartars, Muscovy's army was mostly on horseback, equipped with bow and arrow, saber, and lance. It was mobile and daring, but not capable of long persistent resistance. To a Western observer in those days, the boldly charging Muscovite cavalry seemed to be saying to the enemy: "Retreat or we will flee!" These tactics were successful in the East against the remnants of the Tartar bands, but not against the professional mercenary troops of Sweden and Poland-Lithuania. These were already equipped with firearms and showed less and less inclination to retreat.

Considerable portions of the land which became directly available to Ivan the Terrible through the break-up of the old boyars' estates

under his *oprichnina* were distributed among new members of the *dvoriane* class. But the resulting increase in military servitors proved an insufficient and ineffective measure in Muscovy's military contest with Sweden and Poland-Lithuania. The war dragged on and large border districts of northwestern Muscovy were invaded and devastated by the enemy.

Muscovy's agriculture was beset by equally troublesome problems. The prevailing method of cultivation was the open field system. As in Europe of the eighth and ninth centuries, the Muscovite peasant commune tilled unenclosed fields subdivided into strips, so as to give each peasant a fair share in the good and in the poor soil. Three fields were usually leased by the commune and subdivided among its members. One field lay fallow, while the other two were under cultivation. This system was adequate as long as subsistence agriculture was the aim, but it was not able to yield any considerable surplus beyond providing the peasant and his family with daily bread.

Yet Muscovy's state treasury was in desperate need of the fiscal means to cover the vast expenditures of the large and sprawling state. However, there was little money in circulation. Particularly since the stream of silver and gold which was extracted in the New World mines and which flooded Europe during the sixteenth century, contributing so much to the rise of capitalism, never reached Russia. Lacking lucrative sources of revenue, the state of Muscovy imposed heavy dues in kind and in money on the peasants, regardless of the fact that they were engaged in subsistence agriculture. The peasantry responded to this policy by abandoning the fields by the score and fleeing south, beyond the frontier of Muscovy, into the free, open, and fertile spaces of the steppes.

Ivan the Terrible's *oprichnina*, being a persecution movement against the old landowning class of boyars, tended to intensify the sense of insecurity among the peasants and their desire to escape to less troubled regions. In the later part of the sixteenth century the southward exodus of the Muscovite peasantry assumed catastrophic proportions, creating an acute labor shortage and leaving a large percentage of arable land in the central regions of the country uncultivated and deserted.

In order to arrest this movement and to remedy the agricultural crisis, Ivan the Terrible's successors began issuing a series of decrees which restricted the peasants' freedom of movement with increasing

stringency until, by the middle of the seventeenth century, a large percentage of Muscovy's rural population was permanently attached to the soil and converted into serfs. This is what gave Russian serfdom such formidable proportions. It did not develop within the framework of small, decentralized political units comparable to feudal Europe, but grew within the boundaries of a large, centralized state.

So then, one element of medievalism, preoccupation with religion, fused Muscovy's society into a cohesive, harmonious entity. Viewed from this angle, Muscovy appears as a closely knit community of homogeneous households or families, all living according to identical customs, traditions, and beliefs. But the second feature of medievalism, the predominance of agriculture as the principal productive force and the mainstay of society, produced dangerous elements of discord and disruption in Muscovy. Viewed from this angle, the country appears as a three-tiered pyramid, the component parts of which were each struggling with an insoluble problem. The trouble with the boyars was that they were unable to forget their past as independent rulers. They were unable to see themselves as equals, as members of the leading upper class upon whose shoulders rested the responsibility of foremost state officials. The trouble with the military servitors, the *dvoriane*, was that it was beyond the strength of this feudal army to battle successfully with the contemporary professional armies of the West. The trouble with the peasantry was that it was engaged in subsistence agriculture and yet burdened with taxes in order to supply the state with financial resources.

If we were listening to the voices of the Muscovite people in the sixteenth century, we would hear two distinct and contrasting themes. We would hear the voices of the people united harmoniously in common prayer and response to the teachings of Christian conduct and living. But we would also hear a continuous unhappy chorus of dissent and dissatisfaction. There would be the voice of an angry Tsar impatient with his boyars. There would also be the voices of quarreling boyars engaged in petty mutual disputes. And the voices of exhausted, discouraged *dvoriane*, frightened by the superior skill of Western armies, would mingle with the groans of a despairing peasantry protesting against an excessive tax burden.

As the sixteenth century went on, the voices of discord, bewilderment, and dismay grew louder, merging into a loud and strident clamoring which plunged the country into a state of general turmoil

and upheaval. Shaken by military setbacks and weakened by the agricultural crisis, the social structure of Muscovy gave way under the final and crowning blow of a dynastic crisis which occurred in 1598 with the death of Ivan the Terrible's last surviving son Fedor and the extinction of the ruling dynasty.

In England, the seventeenth century opened with a constitutional struggle between monarchy and parliament, out of which the idea of representative government was destined to emerge victorious. In Muscovy, political immaturity and medieval traditionalism were such that the people stood helpless and bewildered by a vacant throne. Muscovy's Times of Trouble had begun. Social dissent drove divided and antagonistic groups of the community to violent efforts to fill the vacuum with a representative of their own choice. During the following fifteen years the throne was ascended and vacated in rapid succession by individuals backed by various factions of society. One wave of social turmoil after another came and went. Each seemed to carry on its crest controversies and grievances of the past, which now swept and broke over the country with renewed and concentrated force. Several factions of the boyars tried to regain power, while the imagination of the peasantry was captured for a brief span by the dark and adventurous figure of a Pretender claiming to be Ivan the Terrible's youngest son Dmitri.

While chaos in the country was still complete, Sweden and Poland decided to reach out for spoils. The Swedes took Novgorod while a Polish army penetrated as far as Moscow and put a Polish prince on the throne. It was this invasion and the spectacle of Muscovy's capital and throne in the hands of foreigners which brought civil strife and inner dissent among the Russian people to an end. Armed resistance against the Poles was organized, with active assistance from the church, by representatives of the middle strata of Muscovite society. In 1612 the Poles were driven from Moscow, and in the following year Mikhail Romanov was elected to the throne. The fact that Ivan the Terrible had been married to Mikhail's great aunt provided a hereditary link with the old dynasty and influenced this popular choice. The Times of Trouble thus came to an end.

External pressure of foreign enemies thus stood at the beginning and at the end of this period of Muscovite life, ushering it in and bringing it to an end. The pressure of the Tartar yoke had driven the divided and dissenting units of Russian territory to unity. And

the pressure of Polish and Swedish invasion had again united the dissenting parts of Muscovy's social structure, fusing them into a solid front determined to repulse the foe.

But this cohesion was only a temporary phenomenon. The roots of inner conflict were still there. The struggle to reconcile the country's size and structure, form and contents, ends and means, feudal spirit and national territory, was to begin anew. It filled the following centuries of Russia's development and is continuing to this day.

From Zoshchenko's Sketches*

Translated from the Russian

By J. A. POSIN

THE DEVIL'S LITTLE PLAYTHING

THE other day I went into a toy shop. They offered me a new summer-time game, especially made on a foreign pattern, called "Diabolo." Some sort of a French game for children. A cord tied to two sticks and a roller. One has to throw that roller up into the air and catch it on the cord. That's all. A gay, easy game, especially for out-of-doors. Oh, these French, they'd always think up something amusing!

I bought this game and presented it to my son. The boy began to throw the roller up, and almost killed himself. The roller had come down on his head and floored him. I felt the weight of the roller in my hand; indeed, a heavy devil. It might knock a camel off his feet, let alone a child.

I went to the shop to demand an explanation: why do they make such rubbish?

They told me at the shop: "There is nothing for you to complain about. This plaything is made with perfect adherence to foreign patterns. Only there they make rollers out of rubber, and ours are made out of wood. But the rest, to the minutest detail, is the same. They have a cord, and we have a cord. Only ours curls in the middle a little. Can't play with it as the roller won't fit. But, then, the rest is the same. Although, speaking frankly, there isn't any rest, except the sticks."

I said: "What shall I do, then?"

They said: "Why, for your own peace of mind, don't let the child lay his hands on this game. Nail it up somewhere over his bed. Let the child just look at it and amuse himself that way."

*Mikhail Zoshchenko was born in 1895. After the Revolution, he became the outstanding satirist of Soviet Russia, enjoying great popularity for more than two decades. Subsequent to Zhdanov's speech of August, 1946, attacking the literary periodicals *Zvezda* and *Leningrad* for publishing his works, Zoshchenko disappeared from the literary scene. So far as known, the satirical sketches which follow have not previously been translated into English; they are taken from the collections: *Dni nashei zhizni*, Riga, 1929, and *Izbrannye rasskazy*, Leningrad, 1935 [Ed.].

I said: "Thanks a lot for the advice! I'll do that."

I did that.

Only I didn't nail it up over the boy's bed, but over a cupboard. Because, I figured, if I should nail it over the bed and it should fall down, it might kill an innocent child for the sins of his parents.

Fathers eat sour grapes, and children's teeth are set on edge.

POOR TRUPIKOV

Ivan Semyonovich Trupikov, a high-school teacher, smoothed his tailless coat, coughed in his palm, and with timid steps entered the classroom.

"You late again?" sternly asked the student monitor.

Ivan Semyonovich became confused and, greeting the class with utmost politeness, said in a low voice:

"It's the streetcar, you know. . . . You see, I couldn't get a place in the streetcar. . . ."

"Alibis!" sneered the monitor.

The teacher timidly sat down on the edge of the chair and shut his eyes. Strange memories were crowding in his mind.

Here he is, the teacher of history, entering the class, and all the students respectfully rise. And he, Ivan Semyonovich Trupikov, with a firm, stern step goes to his desk, opens the record, and . . . oh, what an unusual silence descends upon the class! And then Trupikov, looking severely into the record, calls out a name:

"Semyonov, Nikolai!"

The teacher suddenly shook, opened his eyes, and said in a quiet voice:

"Semyonov . . ."

"What d'you want?" asked the student looking busily at a stamp collection.

"Nothing, sir," said the teacher. "Nothing in particular. Don't pay any attention."

"What 'nothing in particular'?"

"Nothing, sir . . . I was just curious to find out if young comrade Semyonov were here."

"Here!" said Semyonov looking at a stamp against the light.

The teacher paced the classroom.

"I beg your pardon, young comrades," he said. "You were assigned for today . . . I mean, it was proposed that you read about the reforms of the former emperor Alexander I. So, perhaps, pardon

me, someone will tell me about the reforms of the former Alexander I . . . Believe me, young comrades, I speak of emperors with contempt."

Laughter rang through the class.

"Pay no attention," said the teacher. "I'm just a little agitated, young comrades. Do not misinterpret my words. I do not insist. I am even glad that you do not wish to tell me . . . I am nervous, comrades. . . ."

"Will you shut up for a minute!" sounded somebody's voice. "Croaking like a magpie."

"I won't say a word. Yes, sir . . ." the teacher said. "I just want to" . . . in a whisper . . . "ask the young comrade Semechkin what political news he has read in the newspaper *Pravda*."

Semechkin put the newspaper aside and said:

"What is that? A hint? You mean I should put away the paper? Put away *this* paper? Why, do you know that . . . Why, for this I'll . . ."

"That's all right, sir . . . That's perfectly all right. As God is my witness . . . That is, I didn't mean anything about God . . . Do not misinterpret." The teacher, upset, resumed pacing the room.

"Stop making a nuisance of yourself!" somebody said. "Stand at the blackboard!"

The teacher stood at the blackboard and, blowing his nose into a rag, quietly wept.

THE WESTINGHOUSE BRAKE

The thing is, Volodka Bokov was a little bit pie-eyed. Otherwise, of course, he would not have risked such a crime. He was loaded. If you must know, Volodka Bokov had downed a flagon of Erivan vodka just before the train started, and made up the rest with beer. And as regards food, he ate only one sportsman's wienie. What kind of food is that?

So, of course, the fellow got disorganized. Because the combination is very caustic. One's head goes around from it, and various ideas ripen in one's breast, and one feels like showing off before the esteemed public.

So, Volodka got into the train and began to show off a little. He said he was the kind of person to whom everything was permitted, and that even the people's tribunal, in case of any misunderstanding, would uphold his side every time. Because he was—let the public

know—of an excellent social origin: his grandfather had been a cow-shepherd, and his mama was the most unsophisticated country-woman. . . .

And so Volodka kept on grinding with his tongue. Some sort of a mood hit him—he felt like showing off. And at that point a citizen emerged opposite Volodka in the carriage. This citizen had cotton in his ear and he was neatly dressed, not without luxury. And he said:

“If you keep on telling lies like that a little longer, they’ll put you in the clink at the next station.”

Volodka said:

“Don’t you touch my self-esteem. They can’t put me in the clink because of my origin. No matter what I do, I shall get lenient treatment. Because I am a hereditary peasant and proletarian.”

Well, that’s the kind of mood that hit him! He was drunk, that is.

And the public began to express its displeasure on this score. And the more venomous one among them began to egg Volodka on. And some fellow in a blue cap, the low-down soul, said:

“Why, dear fellow! Why don’t you smash the window to pieces, and we shall see whether you will be put in the clink or go scot-free. Or,” he said, “even better than that: leave the window alone but instead stop the train by turning this handle! . . . This is the brake. . . .”

Volodka said:

“Which handle do you mean? Express yourself more precisely, you parasite. . . .”

The one in the blue cap replied:

“Why, this one. This is the Westinghouse brake. Jerk it from the left to this side. And we shall see what happens next.”

The people, and the citizen who had cotton in his ear, tried, of course, to stop the egger-on. They said it was pretty shameful to suggest sober ideas to a pie-eyed man.

But Volodka Bokov got up and so jerked the handle from the left that a cord which had been attached there with a government seal tore loose.

Everybody turned mute on the spot. Silence suddenly reigned among the passengers. The only thing one could hear was the sound of the wheels. And nothing else.

The fellow in the blue cap exclaimed:

“Oh, plague take him, he did stop it! What do you know? . . .”

At that, many jumped from their seats. The blue-cap wearer

tried to sneak out to the platform, away from trouble, but the passengers didn't let him. The man with cotton in his ear said:

"This is hoodlumism. In a moment, the whole train will stop. . . . That helps to wear out the rolling stock. Besides, there is the delay."

Volodka Bokov himself got a little scared. He said:

"Stop the one in the blue cap. Let me and him be put in the clink together. He egged me on to stop the train."

But the train, in the meantime, failed to stop at once.

The passengers said:

"The train can't stop at once. Even though it is a suburban train, it is entitled to a run after the application of the brake. Eighty yards. And on wet rails even more than that."

But the train, in the meantime, just continued on its way. It went close to a mile, and still there was no perceptible slowing down.

The one with cotton in his ear said:

"It seems the brake is out of order, so-to-speak."

Volodka said:

"That's what I've been telling you; they won't do a darn thing to me. Put that in your pipe and smoke it!"

And he sat down.

And at the next stop he got out, refreshed himself a little, and arrived home sober as a crystal.

THE ACTOR

This story really happened. It happened in Astrakhan. An amateur actor told me about this.

Here's what he told me.

"Now, here you citizens are asking me whether I have been an actor? Well, I have. Played in a theatre. Came into contact with that art. But, really, it's nonsense. There's nothing outstanding in it. . . . Of course, if you give it deeper thought, there's a lot of good in this art. You come out on the stage, let us say, and the spectators look, and among the spectators there are your friends, relatives by marriage, neighbors. You see them winking at you from their seats as if to say: 'Courage, Vasya! Give it both barrels!' And you, on the other hand, make signs to them, meaning: 'Don't worry, citizens, we know a thing or two. You won't catch us napping.'

"But, upon still deeper thought, there is nothing good in that profession. You just get your bile in an uproar. Here, once we were putting on the play *Who Is To Blame?*, with the pre-revolutionary

setting. It is a very powerful play. In one act, there appear robbers who rob a merchant in plain view of the public. This scene comes out most realistic. The merchant, of course, yells and kicks with his feet. But he is being robbed nevertheless. An eerie play.

"So, we put on this play.

"But just before the curtain went up, one amateur actor, the one who played the merchant, took a couple of drinks. And the tramp got so flustered in the heat of the production that we saw he was not fit to carry on the rôle of the merchant. As soon as he came to the front of the stage, he crushed the footlights with his foot, on purpose.

"Ivan Palych, the director of the play, says to me:

"'We can't let him out on the stage in the second act. He will crush every one of the footlights, the son of a bitch. Perhaps,' he says, 'you will play the part in his place? The audience is stupid; it won't be able to tell the difference.'

"I say:

"'Citizens, I cannot come out to the footlights. Please don't ask it.' I say: 'I just ate two watermelons. My brain doesn't work so well.'

"But he says:

"'You've got to save us, friend. At least for one act. Perhaps the other actor will come to his senses after a while. Don't let educational work down.'

"They finally prevailed upon me. I came out to the footlights.

"And, according to the play, I came as I was, in my own jacket and trousers. I only pasted on a little beard. So, I came out. And the audience, though stupid, immediately recognized me.

"'Aha,' they say, 'Vasya came out! Courage!' they say, 'Give it both barrels!'

"I say:

"'Courage I've got, citizens, since the moment is critical. The regular actor,' I say, 'is strongly under the influence and cannot come out to the footlights. He's vomiting.'

"The act started.

"I play the merchant in that act. That is, I shout and try to beat off the robbers with my feet. And I feel as if one of the amateur robbers is trying to pick my pocket for real. I pull my jacket about me, aside from the actors. I beat them off, hitting them straight in their faces, honest!

" 'Don't come near me, you scum,' I say, 'I ask you as a gentleman.'

"But, according to the play, they become more and more aggressive. They get my pocketbook—with 180 rubles—and they try to get my watch.

"I shout with all my might:

" 'Help! Citizens! They're robbing me in earnest!'

"And that produces full effect. The stupid audience is delighted, and they clap their hands. They yell:

" 'Give, Vasya, give! Beat them off, dear fellow! Hit them on the head, the devils!'

"I shout:

" 'It doesn't work, friends!'

"And I continue beating them straight on their snouts.

"I see that one amateur is bleeding profusely, but the others become enraged and more aggressive, the scoundrels.

" 'Friends!' I yell. 'What is this? What should I suffer for?'

"Here the director poked his head from the wings.

" 'Good boy, Vasya,' says he. 'You are playing the part wonderfully. Let's have some more.'

"I see that the shouts don't help because, no matter what I yell, it comes out straight according to the play.

"I got on my knees.

" 'Friends,' I say. 'Director Ivan Palych,' I say. 'I can't go on! Pull down the curtain! They've robbed me of my last savings! They're in earnest!'

"Here, many theatrical experts—seeing that the words don't belong in the play—come out of the wings. The prompter, thanks be to him, climbs out of his booth.

" 'It seems, citizens,' he says, 'that the merchant's wallet was stolen in earnest.'

"They pulled down the curtain. They brought me water in a ladle. They let me drink.

" 'Friends,' I say, 'Director Ivan Palych,' I say. 'What is this? According to the play, someone has lifted my wallet.'

"Well, they searched the company. But they found no money. However, someone threw the empty wallet into the wings. The money disappeared without a trace, as if it had been burned in a stove.

"You say 'art'? I know your art. I had experience!"

THE MAN FROM THE METROPOLIS

The other day the election of the chairman of the local Soviet took place in the village of Usachi, Kaluga province. The city Party cell which was "sponsoring" the village had sent down a comrade from the city whose name was Vedernikov. He was standing on the freshly planed logs and telling the assemblage:

"The international situation, citizens, is clearer than clear. Unfortunately, we cannot linger on that. Therefore, let us move to the current moment of the day, that is, to the election of the chairman in place of Ivan Kostyliov. That parasite cannot be vested with the full extent of State power, and is therefore demoted. . . ."

The representative of the village poor, a peasant by the name Mikhailo Bobrov, was standing on a log next to the city comrade and, being extremely anxious lest the city phrases be incomprehensible to the understanding of the peasants, was voluntarily and spontaneously explaining the vague sentences of the speech.

"In a word," Mikhailo Bobrov said, "this parasite, may ulcers infest his soul, Kostyliov, Ivan Maksimovich, cannot be divested and is therefore demoted. . . ."

"And in place of the mentioned Ivan Kostyliov," the city orator continued, "it is proposed that a man be elected because as we don't need parasites. . . ."

"And in place of the parasite," Bobrov elucidated, "this, ulcers in his soul, bootlegger, although he is related to me by marriage, it is proposed to change and nominate. . . ."

"It is proposed," said the city comrade, "to nominate persons as candidates."

Out of the fulness of his emotions, Mikhailo Bobrov threw down his cap and made a gesture inviting immediate nomination of persons as candidates.

The assembly was silent for a moment.

"Well, perhaps Bykin, eh? Or Eremey Ivanovich Sekin, eh?" someone suggested timidly.

"All right," said the city comrade. "Bykin. We'll write it down."

"We'll write it down right away," Bobrov explained.

The crowd, which had been silent up to that point, began to shout in a frightful manner and to yell out the names, demanding that those candidates be immediately inducted into the office of chairman:

"Bykin, Vasya! Eremey Ivanovich Sekin! Mikolaev! . . ."

Vedernikov, the city comrade, was writing these names on his pad.

"Friends!" somebody shouted. "What kind of election is this? Sekin, Mikolaev! We've got to elect leading comrades. The ones that really measure up. The ones that have had experience in a big city; that's what we need. So that they'd know everything, through and through!"

"Right!" the mob shouted. "Leading comrades are the thing! Everywhere they elect that kind!"

"It is the correct trend," the city comrade said. "Let us have some names."

The assembly fell silent.

"Perhaps, Lyoshka Konovalov?" timidly said someone. "He is the only one who has been to the big city. He is a man from the metropolis."

"Lyoshka!" voices shouted in the crowd. "Step forward. Lyoshka. Speak to the assembly!"

Lyoshka Konovalov made his way through the crowd, came out to the logs, and, flattered by everyone's attention, bowed in a city fashion, holding his hand to his heart.

"Speech, Lyoshka!" the voices shouted.

"Well," said Lyoshka, feeling somewhat embarrassed, "you can do worse than elect me. Sekin or, who is it?—Mikolaev—what sort of candidates are these? Why, they are country hicks, hayseeds. But I rubbed shoulders with city folks for maybe two years. You can well elect me. . . ."

"Speak, Lyoshka! Report to the assembly!" the mob shouted again.

"I can speak," said Lyoshka. "Why shouldn't I speak, seeing that I know everything. I know statutes, or ordinances, or articles. Or, for example, the criminal code. I know all that. For two years, maybe, I rubbed shoulders. . . . I would be sitting in a cell, and others would run up to me. 'Please,' they'd say, 'explain, Lyoshka, what is the article and which statute? . . .'"

"What sort of a cell?" people in the crowd asked.

"The cell?" said Lyoshka. "Cell number fourteen. In Kresty prison."

"Why!" the assembly was surprised. "What did you stay in jail for, fellow?"

Lyoshka became embarrassed and looked at the crowd confusedly.

"The merest trifle," he said vaguely.

"Politics, or hooked something?"

"Politics," Lyoshka said. "Hooked a mere trifle. . . ."

Lyoshka waved his hand apologetically and, with embarrassment, lost himself in the crowd.

The city comrade Vedernikov, after talking for some time about the new trend of electing the comrades who had had experience in the big city, proposed to vote for Eremey Sekin.

Mikhailo Bobrov, the representative of the poverty-stricken element, explained the sense of these words, and Eremey Sekin was elected unanimously, with one abstention.

The abstainer was Lyoshka Konovalov. He had no stomach for country hayseeds.

Book Reviews

BALZAK, S. S., VASYUTIN, V. F., AND FEIGIN, Ya. G. (Editors). *Economic Geography of the USSR*. Translated from the Russian by Robert M. Hankin and Olga Adler Titelbaum. New York, Macmillan, 1949. 620 pp., 83 maps. \$10.00.

The Committee of the Russian Translation Project of the American Council of Learned Societies has made a wise selection. Balzak, Vasyutin, and Feigin's book is the best known textbook of economic geography of the U.S.S.R. Unfortunately, only the first volume is available. The second, containing regional description, gives probably more details as to the distribution of economic activity and also figures of output by small regions.

The text was translated, revised, and checked again, and several obvious mistakes in the figures of the original have been discovered and corrected. The maps from the original have been redrawn and many new maps (19 out of 83) added to help the reader in finding the cities, towns, or regions mentioned in the text.

In the introduction to the Russian edition, Ya. G. Feigin gives a Soviet view of the science of economic geography. He criticizes the Western "bourgeois" geographers for their allegedly deterministic standpoint and lack of historical approach (p. 14). This attitude is rightly considered by the translators as one-sided (pp. 39 and 43). They also state that certain citations from Hettner and Huntington are "quoted out of context" (p. 10).

The reader is warned by Dr. J. A.

Morrison to read the book "with discrimination and sophistication" as the approach to the subject is shaped by the Marx-Lenin-Stalin doctrines. He also stresses that the citations from Soviet leaders and theoreticians as well as from resolutions of the congresses of the Communist Party are astonishingly numerous. The reader is amazed by the unnecessarily fervid praise of the Soviet leaders. Those critical observations are, however, purposely limited by the translators to the introductory part of the book. Pages 1 to 516 represent the translation of the Russian original without translators' comment. Short editorial notes are welcomed by the reader, who otherwise would have difficulties. Moreover, in a new edition it would be desirable to add throughout the text the equivalent in the English system for degrees centigrade, kilometers, *versts*, *poods*, etc.

The maps are very clear. Probably for the sake of economy a few of them are greatly reduced (fig. 5). Instead of the usual hypsometric map (which can be found in any good atlas), the editors of the American edition included a large map of types of surface configuration. The limit of continental glaciation in the Ice Age and principal areas of karst topography are also inserted in this map. Apparently by mistake the Carpathian mountains are not represented (fig. 4). The maps which indicate the position of regions and boundaries (figs. 1, 2, 19) are very welcome. Also the "Jewish Autonomous Region" should be indicated on fig. 19 instead of fig. 8, which is

purely climatic. The additional boundary lines (those of 1945 and on fig. 19 also those of 1914) have been introduced as approximate lines.

The descriptions of the main traits of hydrography, climate, soils, and natural zones give an adequate introduction to the discussion of the development of the country's agriculture and land use possibilities. These phenomena are illustrated by a set of small but very well chosen maps which cover most of the essential aspects of the problems.

Perhaps more attention should be paid to the seasonal changes affecting the rivers (ice cover, floods, level of water). The low level of the Caspian Sea produced in the last years an essential change in the northeastern shore line (the long narrow bay of Kultuk dried out). The translators preferred, however, to represent on the maps the average coastline during the last hundred years.

The description of the mineral wealth is aided by a map, rich in content, which shows the location of deposits, without, however, indicating quantities or relative importance. (This is partly done in the text and tables.) The U.S.S.R.'s claim that they possess nearly 59% of the world's oil and even 85% of the world's potassium salts seems hardly probable. The Soviet's share in world oil production is still below 10%. The use of gas produced from wood as fuel for motorcars is not mentioned.

In the second chapter there is a long description of the backwardness of the economic life in Tsarist Russia, preceded by a fervid discussion of A. Weber's theory of industrial location (so-called "Standortstheorie"). The authors use

mostly the arguments from Marx's and Lenin's works. According to them, Weber's theory is an "absolute fantasy," and "The enemies of the people used Weber's theory in the struggle against the creation of a second coal-metallurgical base in the East of the U.S.S.R. . . ." during the decade which followed the 1917 Revolution.

The inhuman attitude of Tsarist Russia's government towards the non-Russian peoples, their persecution, oppression, and seizure of their lands for Russian colonization—is underlined. The authors describe the post-revolutionary struggle between various groups of Russian economists: the Stalinists, who defended the possibility and necessity of industrialization of the country and creation of new industrial regions distant from the Western frontiers, and the Trotskyites, who fought "foaming at the mouth" against this idea. Thus the latter are now called "saboteurs" and "enemies of the people" (pp. 145–146), who had been acting "in order to facilitate the contemplated [foreign] intervention in our country" (p. 146).

The authors promote (according to the decisions of the Communist Party Congresses) the decentralization of industry, duplication of the main industrial centers, the building of smaller or medium-sized factories instead of "gigantic" ones, and further "industrialization of formerly backward national republics."

The fourth chapter deals with the distribution of population. The comparison of the censuses of 1926 and 1939 shows an increase of population and a shifting of a large proportion of the inhabitants from agriculture to the industrial life and

to the towns. The growth of the cities is well illustrated on maps (figs. 25 and 26).

The fifth chapter describes the industrial life in the U.S.S.R. Comparison of the world position of Tsarist Russia in 1913 and that of the U.S.S.R. in 1935-38 proves the enormous progress that has been achieved in production in most fields. It is rather surprising to learn that the U.S.S.R. was first in the production of locomotives and synthetic rubber, and second in oil (in 1950, third). There are only a few lines about the production of precious metals (the U.S.S.R. is the world's second in gold) but there is no mention of uranium. (In the Great Soviet Atlas of the World, part I, the deposits known at the time, i.e., 1937, are shown.) On the post-war economic maps of the U.S.S.R., even more of the important sites of production have been left off.

The reader would be very much interested to have in the next edition approximate figures for the recent Soviet mining and industrial production (e.g. 25 mil. tons of steel, 250 mil. tons of coal, 36 mil. tons of oil, 78 bil. kw of electric power, 290,000 motor vehicles, etc. per annum) as unveiled by the Soviet leaders.

The handicraft cooperative industry plays an important rôle in the production of consumer goods. There are hundreds of villages in central and northern Russia where handicraft is the main occupation. Before the Revolution they had been individually owned. Only a part of these *artels* is represented on the map (fig. 50, page 332).

Chapter VI deals with the development of agriculture in the U.S.S.R. The authors compare

the pre-revolutionary backwardness of the country with the status of agriculture in 1938. Collectivization of the farms and mechanization of work are praised and the pre-1917 production compared with that of 1938. The catastrophic decrease in the number of head of domestic animals in 1930-32 is explained by the "sabotage of the kulaks." The historic fact that the collectivization was compulsory and that the peasants resisted in many regions is omitted. It is obviously mere wishful thinking when the authors say: "Thanks to the *kolkhozes*, rural poverty has disappeared and conditions have been created conducive to a comfortable and cultural life for all the working peasants" (p. 349, bottom). The average yield of grain reached one-half ton per acre. This shows progress, but it doesn't mean a real achievement; the average yield of grain in neighboring Poland is also one-half ton per acre, but Poland doesn't use as much machinery on her small individual farms. It is a puzzle how "more than 400,000 *kolkhozes* [are] producing [meat] for the market" (p. 416, bottom) if the total number of the *kolkhozes* is about 242,400 (p. 349).

It is an astonishing achievement of Soviet science (especially of Russian botanist Vavilov, who died as a Soviet political prisoner) that they produce a certain proportion of rubber and bast crops from special plants carefully studied and planted in the hot and warm climates available in the U.S.S.R. (pp. 402-408).

The rôle of Michurin and Lysenko is emphasized. Michurin is called "the great worker in transforming nature" (p. 360). The Party is hopeful of developing in two or three years a frost-resistant strain of

wheat. This means a great deal of self-confidence and a belief in the possibility of the rapid creation of certain properties by methods of selective breeding of grain.

The authors agree that "there are very large areas of virgin soil covered by brush in the U.S.S.R. When these are cleared, extensive arable areas will be available for grain and other crops." "[In] the Trans-Urals and Siberia, there are enormous reserves of land for plowing" (p. 364).

Cotton sown in the European part of the U.S.S.R. yields only one-third as much per acre as that of southern Turkestan, but in spite of this fact, it is cultivated in the southern part of the Ukraine and Kuban as a still larger area is required.

There is a gap in this chapter with regard to the distribution of forests and timber production. Some references to forests can be found in the first chapter ("Natural Resources") and the fifth ("Distribution of Industry").

The seventh chapter, dealing with transportation, gives a survey and short history of railways, highways, waterways, important canals (to a great extent built by forced labor), and airlines. Some of the wartime improvements in communication (mainly in Europe) are described. Quite possibly there have been other new lines built in Asia.

The ruble (p. 534) was "devalued to an official rate of 20 cents but with widely fluctuating value on the non-official market." (In February, 1950, it was revalued again to 25 cents.) It is essential to stress here that the value of the ruble on the non-official market and according to its purchasing power represents only about 3 to 4 cents.

The frequent quotations from

Marx, Lenin, and Stalin, the condemning of the kulaks and other "enemies of the people," the praising of the Communist régime, and the representation of the Soviet people as prosperous give the reader an idea of the extent to which the authors are obliged to saturate the text with "educational" additions required by the régime. The assertion that "the Tannu Tuva People's Republic on August 17, 1944, requested admission into the Soviet Union . . ." (p. 545) means annexation, expressed in Soviet terminology.

The 116 pages of statistical tables, glossaries, indexes, etc. are a very desirable addition to the book. There is, however, a small mistake in the explanation of the word *rendzina* (p. 541), which is an old Polish word and has nothing in common with the word for rubber, which is *guma*.

The facts and figures of the book refer to the period 1935-38. Since then, important changes have occurred, and the war has shaken the economic balance of the U.S.S.R. During the invasion, occupation, and retreat of the Germans, very important regions of mining and heavy industry were destroyed, and fertile black soil plains occupied. The development of Asiatic areas was speeded up during the war. No doubt the postwar rehabilitation and reconstruction has greatly changed the Soviet economy. So far, only a few absolute figures for the intended targets for 1950 are known, and most of the other data are published in percentages of the lowest postwar level.

The problem of commerce (internal and foreign) has not been touched in this work. The Soviet state is working for its economic in-

dependence from foreign sources and for self-sufficiency. This has been achieved to a great extent. The importation of consumers' goods is entirely insignificant. An extensive foreign trade ($\frac{2}{3}$ of the whole value of foreign trade) exists only within the Soviet sphere (i.e. with "satellite" states, China, and occupation zones), and only occasionally and to a small extent with other countries.

Another problem which is not treated in this book is that of consumption, which is astonishingly low for two reasons: the production of consumers' goods is very low, and the underpaid consumer is not in a position to buy even those which are produced.

The authors could not discuss many other problems for obvious reasons. They could not even mention the fact that a large proportion of work is done by a non-free population, that the wages and the standard of living of the workers are extremely low. Instead, we find a contrary assertion that "there is no proletarian class . . ." in the U.S.S.R. The economic activity of the natives of the arctic lands is not discussed. The reader of the book will finish it with little idea of the everyday life of the people.

In the difficult conditions under which they had to work, the authors no doubt did their best. The decision to translate the book strictly according to the Russian original gives the Western world a sample of the Russian style of teaching and of a typical Soviet textbook saturated with official ideology.

The work fills a gap in the geographic literature in the English language, and the Russian Transla-

tion Project is to be congratulated for bringing it out.

B. ZABORSKI

McGill University

SOROKIN, PITIRIM A. *Leaves from a Russian Diary—and Thirty Years After*. Boston, The Beacon Press, 1950. 346 pp. \$3.50.

When the February Revolution began, Pitirim A. Sorokin was a professor in the University of Petrograd. He was also a sworn enemy of Tsarism, a revolutionary of long standing, a graduate of the Tsar's political prisons, and a leader in the Social Revolutionary Party. At the close of the first day of the Revolution he noted in his diary: "I looked at my books and manuscripts. I suppose they will have to be put aside for a time. . . . This is no time for study. Action is the thing."

The next months and years were certainly filled with action of a type he could not have foreseen. The Duma, the Soviet, editorship of the Essar paper, *Delo Naroda*, followed after the party split by the editorship of the right-wing Essar journal, *Narodnaya Volya*; the Peasants' Conference and Soviet; secretaryship to Kerensky; the Moscow Conference; election to the Constituent Assembly; arrests, imprisonments, releases—even a partial catalogue is bewildering. At the end of 1918, Sorokin was released from jail along with other intellectuals as part of Lenin's plan for enlisting their aid in building his new Russia. In 1922, Sorokin was banished from Russia by the Cheka. He got out safely, thanks to the intercession of an old friend, and was even able to take with him some of his books and

papers. About eighteen months later, Sorokin arrived in the United States, and it was here that he wrote the *Leaves from a Russian Diary*.

The book was originally published in 1924. The present edition, brought out by the Beacon Press, makes that material again available (the original edition has long been out of print). It also includes an entirely new chapter under the general heading of "Thirty Years After." Partly because of its merit but mostly because it is new, this chapter is likely to be the primary focus of attention. It is stimulating and provocative and well worth reading. But it is of less immediate importance to the student than the rest of the book.

The critical reader will be doubtful about Sorokin's account on at least three scores. First, he was one of the losers in the Revolution and he wrote the *Leaves* at a time when his disappointment was keen. Second, the book was written mostly from memory although Sorokin was able to use the rather sketchy notes which had survived his adventures. Third, the original publisher made very generous use of quotation marks (and no changes have been made in the new edition) thus giving the impression that much of the dialogue was quoted with literal accuracy. This was not the case. Professor Sorokin did not keep stenographic notes and the "quoted" dialogue represents not the *ipsissima verba* of the speakers but an attempt to present the essence of the exchanges. It seems to have been done with a minimum of distortion and a remarkable degree of accuracy.

As to the question of possible second-guessing (since the book was written more than six years after

the events), a conclusive answer is available concerning Sorokin's analyses of the events of 1917. His writings in the two journals noted above, particularly his editorials in April (in the second paper), show that he did not change the essentials of his analyses after a lapse of time. The hard-headed realism with which Sorokin judged the wordy sessions and impractical actions of his associates, the soundness of his apprehensions and warnings, and the clarity of his vision lift his record of events far above those of most observers of the Revolution. This section of his book is the most remarkable and the most valuable.

Bitterness there certainly was in Sorokin's account, but time has validated his judgments. He was much closer to the mark than those who ignored the cruelties of the Revolution or waved them aside as only a passing phase. And it is because past judgments have been proved so good that his current analysis deserves careful attention.

The Russian Revolution, Sorokin holds, was neither an isolated disease nor were horrors peculiar to it alone. It succeeded because it attacked what was already disintegrating. It failed because it was itself a part of that process of disintegration and was therefore incapable of becoming a creative force. Moreover, it has never fulfilled its promises of greater freedom in society and politics, or of the abolition of exploitation and inequalities. It has produced, instead, greater despotism, less freedom, and more inequalities. And it has replaced the limited exploitation of employees by private employers with the exploitation of an entire people by its government.

It has been constructive (and therefore successful) in the carrying

out of certain changes—notably in education, social reform, and industrialization—which were already under way before 1917. But its greatest successes may be measured by its survival, its world-wide diffusion, and by the adoption of certain of its techniques by its most implacable enemies. Its most important historical function, as Sorokin sees it, has been to clear away much of the debris of the disintegrating order and so “to pave the way for a new idealistic or integral order of mankind.”

WARREN B. WALSH
Syracuse University

EMMENS, ROBERT G. *Guests of the Kremlin*. New York, Macmillan, 1949. 291 pp. \$3.00.

When he was piloted by Colonel Emmens from Bucharest to Rome on November 30, 1945, the present reviewer learned casually of the airman's experiences three years earlier as an internee in the Soviet Union. What was then only a chance topic of conversation has now become part of the permanent record of Russian-American relations during World War II, for *Guests of the Kremlin* is an extended account of the experiences of Colonel Emmens and his four Air Force colleagues during their thirteen months of internment spent largely in the villages of Okhuna, Penza district, and Okhansk, Molotov district. Their bomber had taken part in Doolittle's raid on Tokyo in April, 1942, but a shortage of fuel had forced them to land on Soviet territory near Vladivostok instead of proceeding to their more distant destination in China. The Soviet authorities had no grudge against the five American

fliers, but Russia was trying hard to remain neutral in the Pacific war and insisted in carrying out the letter of international law as it affected the grounded airmen. Hence their enforced and prolonged visit in the Soviet Union.

The interest of *Guests of the Kremlin* lies less in the personal experiences of the five airmen, who had a pretty boring time of it until their final escape, than in the observations of the author regarding war-time conditions in the Soviet Union. The general conditions of life for the common people in the Soviet Union, both in peace and in war, may be well enough known. It is nevertheless useful to have this knowledge constantly refreshed by eyewitness accounts, in view of the steady stream of propaganda aiming to conceal and misrepresent these conditions. Emmens and his friends saw little enough from the narrow confines of their various places of internment, and their attention was too often centered on problems relating to plumbing; yet from these slim materials he has been able to reconstruct a lifelike account of certain aspects of the Soviet social and economic system. The reader will sympathize with the petty trials of the airmen, for the volume is written with a certain flair, and will breathe a sigh of relief when they are finally transferred to the border town of Ashkhabad in Central Asia, whence they made their escape into Iran.

C. E. BLACK
Princeton University

BLODGETT, RALPH H. *Comparative Economic Systems*. New York, Macmillan, 1949. 892 pp. \$5.00.

This volume is intended to be

used as a textbook in courses on comparative economic systems. As such it treats capitalism, British socialism, fascism, and the Soviet system. The material on these different systems is integrated under subject headings such as "Agriculture," "The Status of Labor," etc. Our interest is confined to the treatment of the economy of the Soviet Union.

Let it be said at the outset that this book appears to offer the best account of the Soviet economy available in any of the various textbooks on comparative economic systems now available. The author has searched diligently through the English language sources and has attempted with a good deal of success to present his findings succinctly and interestingly. The treatment of Marxian socialism is extensive, and should be more than adequate for a student in such a course.

Having paid tribute to this volume's virtues, the conscientious critic must also point out that it has several outstanding weaknesses. From the point of view of the specialist the most serious, probably, is the fact that the author has limited himself almost exclusively to sources in the English language. Professor Blodgett has used these sources conscientiously, but his work would have been improved if he had had the help of someone able to read and translate the Russian materials for him. It is also most surprising to find that in a book which gives so much space to the Soviet Union, there seems to be no mention at all of the forced labor system of the U.S.S.R. One would think that by this time there had been so many volumes of personal accounts and of analytical character

that any conscientious scholar would be convinced of the reality and importance of this facet of the Soviet system. Another important omission is the lack of any real discussion of the Soviet method of planning as it is actually carried out. There seems to be no clear explicit reference, for example, to the method of balances.

It is to be hoped that in any future revision of his work Professor Blodgett will find it possible to draw upon Soviet sources as well as those in English and to take account of certain major features of the Soviet system which he has failed to deal with adequately in the present volume.

HARRY SCHWARTZ

Syracuse University

CROSS, SAMUEL HAZZARD. *Mediaeval Russian Churches*. Edited by Kenneth John Conant. Cambridge, Massachusetts. The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1949. 95 pp.; 113 illustrations. \$7.50.

This little book, fascinating in content and beautiful in appearance, adds further credit to the names of both the late Professor Samuel H. Cross of Harvard, its author, and of the Mediaeval Academy of America, its publishers. Professor Conant of Harvard deserves much gratitude for his preparation of the manuscript for publication, for his contribution of a biographical sketch of the author and of a brief select bibliography to the volume, and for his arrangement of the 113 marvelous plates. Furthermore, four of those plates are Professor Conant's own conjectural restorations of ancient Russian churches.

The book is composed of four

lectures which Professor Cross delivered at Harvard in 1933, which trace and interpret the development of church architecture in Russia from the tenth to the seventeenth century. The four sections of the volume deal successively with "Kiev and Chernigov," "Novgorod and Pskov," "Vladimir-Suzdal," and "Moscow." The author is primarily interested in Russian church architecture in stone, but he also discusses wooden churches and pays some attention to exterior and interior decoration, certain mosaics and frescoes in particular. The work represents a fine piece of research by an outstanding scholar and testifies to the author's excellent knowledge of both medieval Russian churches themselves and of the literature on the subject.

Ninety pages of text cannot give, of course, a complete picture of Russian medieval church architecture, and Professor Cross depends in all the four essays on a highly individual selection of material. Much has to be left out. This, however, justifies regret rather than complaint, for the work has to be considered in its own terms, as an outline and an interpretation and not as an exhaustive study of the subject. The stress on brevity is reflected even in the treatment of those topics to which Professor Cross devotes the most attention. For instance, he fails to mention in his excellent discussion of the St. Sophia in Kiev the magnificent mosaics of the Fathers of the Church, such as John Chrysostom and Basil the Great, the mosaics which may well be the greatest ornament of the cathedral. (Concerning these mosaics see, for instance, F. Schmidt, *Iskusstvo drevnei Rusi—Ukrainy*. 1919. pp. 53–58.)

The few minor errors which the book contains can easily be avoided in future editions. They include the mention of the Archdeacon Paul of Aleppo as "Patriarch Paul of Antioch" (p. 19) and the reference to "Solomon going to heaven on a gryphon" (p. 57) in the discussion of the fascinating decorations of the Cathedral of St. Dmitry in Vladimir. In the latter case Solomon should be replaced by Alexander the Great. (According to the judgment of Novitsky, Kondakov, and of other scholars; see in detail Novitsky, *Istoriia russkogo iskusstva*, Vol. I, pp. 181–183.)

Professor Cross' statement that onion-shaped cupolas appeared in Russia after 1250 (p. 43) is inexact. The volume itself has reproductions of twelfth century churches with onion-shaped cupolas (see illustrations 43 and 44). It is true that the cupolas on the churches may have been added later, but we also possess twelfth century miniatures depicting onion-shaped cupolas, and the picture of the onion dome found in the Dubilov Gospel dating from 1164 A.D. forms illustration 42 of the book. Moreover, there exists an analogous miniature of the much earlier date of 1100, an indication of the presence of onion-shaped cupolas as early as the eleventh century (See P. Miliukov, *Outlines of Russian Culture*. 1943. Vol. III, p. 8 and illustration 4).

One of the most valuable and interesting aspects of Professor Cross' study is the constant emphasis on the various cultural currents and cross-currents which affected the development of medieval Russian architecture and of Russian culture as a whole. The author uses the accumulated scholarship in the field, as well as his own rare qualifica-

tions as a specialist in several cultures and their interaction, to present a brilliant picture of the interplay of different influences—Byzantine, Italian, German, European in general, Caucasian, and Oriental—as they affected and sometimes determined the course of medieval Russian architecture. Professor Cross' very able exposition and interpretation lends itself nevertheless to various criticisms and qualifications. Beginning with the author's strong emphasis on the Norman origins of the Kievan state, a number of particular cases of cultural influence, as well as some of his broader statements on the subject can well be challenged. A few instances deserve further notice.

In his description of the churches of Chernigov, Professor Cross observes that the Church of the Assumption in the Yeletza Monastery shows evidences of Western influences, and he traces those influences to the Cistercian monastery church at Lehnin in Brandenburg founded in 1180 (p. 16). This indication of a specific influence of a German church on the Church of the Assumption in the Yeletza Monastery is of particular interest because the Chernigov church affected the development of architecture in the Suzdal area. The author's argument is destroyed, however, by a reference to chronology. The Church of the Assumption in the Yeletza Monastery may have been built in the second half of the eleventh century, or it may belong to the first half of the twelfth century, but it cannot be dated from the second half of the twelfth century. It is known that Prince Yuri Dolgoruky, after his campaign from Suzdal against Chernigov in the middle of the twelfth century, built

in the Suzdal area several churches which reflect the architecture of Chernigov. As a matter of fact, their architects evidently had been brought from Chernigov. The earliest among the churches in question is that of Saints Boris and Gleb in Kideksha, constructed in 1152 and modeled after the Church of the Assumption in the Yeletza Monastery. (See, e.g. D. Ainalov, *Geschichte der Russische Monumentalkunst*. 1932. p. 72. Professor Cross himself notes the similarities between the two churches, p. 52.) The Cistercian church built in 1180 could not influence the Church of the Assumption in the Yeletza Monastery in Chernigov constructed no later than the first half of the twelfth century, and therefore it also could not affect Suzdal architecture through the medium of the Chernigov church.

In dealing with Novgorod Professor Cross seems to exaggerate German influences on the architecture of that city-state. In particular, he points to the similarity of the Romanesque elements of the St. Sophia of Novgorod and of the cathedral at Worms (p. 31) and to the German origins of the gabled roofs and corbel-table ornaments encountered on Novgorodian churches (p. 29). The former is probably an example of parallel development rather than of influence: the St. Sophia of Novgorod was constructed by Byzantine architects, and they probably brought the early Romanesque from Byzantium rather than from Worms. As to the gabled roofs, four-sloped roofs, and eight-sloped roofs, Professor Cross himself considers them as a characteristic native reaction to the climate, a function of the struggle against the heavy snow and rain

(p. 29, p. 34, p. 38). Finally, the corbel-table ornaments existed in Chernigov as well as in Germany and could have come to Novgorod from either of the two sources or from both. One of the students of the problem, Ainalov, traces the corbel-table ornaments of Chernigov to Poitiers (Ainalov, *op. cit.*, pp. 38-39).

In the matter of Oriental influences Professor Cross develops one highly questionable interpretation. He states that "tent-shaped spires are one of the few elements of Russian architecture which can rather definitely be traced to Oriental influence transmitted during the period of Tartar domination" (p. 75). In spite of Professor Cross' argument, it appears more correct to consider tent-shaped spires as one of the two basic and original forms of Russian wooden church architecture. Their function was to provide a roof for the churches which were polygonal, i.e. octagonal, rather than square in form. These churches, dating at least as far back as the eleventh century, were as ancient as the square type, and the tent-shaped spires were particular favorites of the Russian people because the polygonal form provided well for the subdivisions of the altar, whereas the church as a whole acquired height. (See especially I. Zabelin, *Russkoe iskusstvo*. 1900. pp. 91-94.)

The minor mistakes of fact and the disputable points of interpretation listed above are in no way meant to detract from the solid merits of Professor Cross' study. *Mediaeval Russian Churches* is indeed to be wholeheartedly recommended to the reader, or rather to various kinds of readers. The specialist will welcome it as a highly

stimulating and informative work of research; the student of Russian history will find it a valuable addition to the usual textbooks and assigned readings; and the general reader will discover in it one of the few good books in English on the subject of Russian culture.

NICHOLAS V. RIASANOVSKY
The State University of Iowa

GOLOKHAVSTOV, G. V., MAGULA, D. A., and others. *Chetyrnadsat (Fourteen)*. New York, 1949.

What astonishes many displaced persons of Russian origin when they meet Russians who had left their country after the Revolution is the fact that the latter have not forgotten their native tongue and often speak a better and purer Russian than they. The desire to preserve this purity of the Russian language and a common love for poetry brought about the organization, ten years ago, of a circle of Russian poets in America. They have now published a collection of their verse under the title *Fourteen*, which merely denotes the number of contributors. The publication of this volume is a cultural achievement in itself, particularly since all the contributors belong to the older generation (the youngest is past forty). Of these, four (G. V. Golokhvastov, D. A. Magula, V. S. Illiaschenko, and E. A. Christiani-Markova) have previously published their verse in a collection *Iz Ameriki (From America)*, which appeared in 1926, but none of them has published verse of any importance in Russia. To only one of them, Illiaschenko, belongs the honor of having published a book in Russia (in 1915). It was a study of the great Russian poet Fet,

which Illiaschenko published under the pseudonym of V. S. Fedina, and which is still being quoted as an authoritative work in the Soviet Union and elsewhere.

The value of the verse in *Fourteen* is very uneven. The best are the contributions of Golokhvastov and Magula, both accomplished craftsmen. The former, a master technician of the Russian verse,—is the author of a collection of 300 half-sonnets and of an epic poem, *The Fall of Atlantis*, of over 8,000 lines. The latter published not long before the last war two collections of his verse, which included some masterly translations. Among the women contributors E. Antonova and E. Markova are outstanding, although the influence on their verse of the greatest living Russian woman poet, Anna Akhmatova, is marked. The unfortunate thing, however, about this collection is the fact that, while it contains a great deal of skillfully written verse, it has very little real poetry, and what poetry there is belongs rather to the turn of the century than to modern times. Too much attention to form has stilted most of the real poetical feeling. An exception is a magnificently wrought sonnet by Golokhvastov, "The Turning Point," which ends with the following lines:

Another world rushed on. With it came
a new man.

Pressed by the stormy charge our most
refined age

In Beauty immobile departs into the
realm of myths.

And we, not closing eyes to all this
novelty,

Gaze at the newcomers as once, upon
the Scythians

With haughty pity, looked the ancient
Greek.

Notwithstanding its poetical shortcomings, *Fourteen* is a vivid example of how deeply Russian expatriates still feel the call of true Russian culture and how they have preserved after more than thirty years of exile the purity and beauty of their native tongue.

LEONID I. STRAKHOVSKY
Watertown, Mass.

SOME RECENT RUSSIAN LANGUAGE TEXTS

ZNAMENSKY, GEORGE A. *Conversational Russian*. Boston-New York-London, Ginn, 1948. 299 pp. \$4.00.

VON GRONICKA, A. AND ZHEMCHUZHNAJA-BATES, H. *Essentials of Russian*. New York, Prentice-Hall, 1948. 327 pp. \$3.75.

FASTENBERG, R. AND RATNER, M. *Basic Russian Reader*. New York-London, Pitman, 1949. 269 pp. \$3.00.

BIRKETT, G. A. *A Modern Russian Course*. Third Edition, Revised. New York, Oxford University Press, 1947. 330 pp. \$2.50.

FAYER, M. H., PRESSMAN, A., AND PRESSMAN, A. F. *Bondar's Simplified Russian Method*. Seventh Edition, Revised. New York-London, Pitman, 1949. 408 pp. \$3.75.

Conversational Russian is a practical manual for teaching and learning the Russian language. Two noteworthy features of this book are the following: 1) vocabulary-building is simplified by the systematic usage of Russian words that have cognates in the English language; 2) emphasis is placed on endings of verbs and substantives, which in a

highly inflected language such as Russian are extremely important, and hyphens are used to set off endings from stems and roots. Still another feature of *Conversational Russian* is the concise handbook of grammar, arranged by paragraphs, to which the student can conveniently refer when answering the questions on grammar posed in each lesson. The over-all excellence of *Conversational Russian* is not marred in the least by such minor slips as the infelicitous translation (pp. 124, 142) of *podmasterye* as "foreman."

Essentials of Russian will provide a most satisfactory foundation for teaching the Russian language at colleges and universities in the United States. The authors strive for simplicity in their presentation of the vagaries of Russian and succeed throughout in giving the reader clear and accurate explanations of the material under consideration. The lessons in this textbook have been carefully arranged to facilitate classroom practice and drill, oral as well as written. Each lesson contains a variety of exercises which help to solidify in the student's mind the grammatical features, idioms, and vocabulary in that lesson. Although a few of the "Common Expressions and Idioms" given in the final lessons appear to be neither common nor particularly idiomatic, the selections from nineteenth and twentieth century Russian writers included in these very lessons are most commendable.

Basic Russian Reader is a textbook written to provide first year Russian students with suitable reading material. Some of the passages are perfectly adequate with respect to subject matter; others will probably fail to hold the interest of the reader. No doubt the choice of

topics for each of the book's thirty-eight lessons, as well as the selections for the section "Poems and Songs," could have been considerably improved. Moreover, the authors have seen fit to put into the text a subdivision containing group games to be played in Russian. Although the originality and freshness of such an approach to the study of the Russian language is laudable, it is unlikely that American students above high school age will find such group games very much to their taste.

G. A. Birkett's *A Modern Russian Course* provides students with a systematic treatment of the grammatical structure of the Russian language. Numerous examples are used to supplement the rules and practices of Russian grammar set forth in the text. Many of the difficulties encountered by students of Russian will, in large measure, be resolved by useful tips and hints sprinkled throughout the book. Possibly the organizational framework, as well as the extensive and detailed grammatical analysis which this textbook features, will tend to make it rather unwieldy in classroom work.

Bondar's Simplified Russian Method has many of the essentials of a good textbook, but it has several weak points that detract from its general effectiveness. Lack of imagination is apparent in the choice of reading matter and useful idioms appear infrequently and are scattered through the book in desultory fashion. And the treatment of the imperfective and perfective aspects of Russian verbs, despite the space devoted to it, fails to clarify sufficiently the misunderstandings that American students have about the Russian verbal system. On the

other hand, this book has its good points, such as the explanation of the difference between the conjunctions *no* and *a* (pp. 33-34), the material on the predicate adjectives (pp. 188-191), and the short selection of popular Russian songs in the Appendix.

A comparison of the approach used to explain the usage of verbal pairs like *khodit:idi*, *yezdit:yekhat*, *vozt:vezti*, *nosit:nesti*, and *vodit:vesti* in the four above-mentioned grammars will perhaps indicate the relative worth of each of them as far as American students of Russian are concerned. In *Bondar's Simplified Russian Method* these verbal pairs are designated as the "potential" form (i.e. *khodit*, *yezdit*, *vozt*, *nosit*, *vodit*) and the "actual" form (i.e. *idi*, *yekhat*, *vezti*, *nesti*, *vesti*). "Potential" in this connection has little or no meaning. In *A Modern Russian Course* the verbal pairs of the imperfective aspect are classified as "double imperfectives," one indicating iterative action (*khodit*, etc.), the

other durative action (*idi*, etc.). This designation is more satisfactory, but the author's brief explanation of what he means by these terms is needed to make them fully comprehensible to the student-reader. *Essentials of Russian* uses the terms "indeterminate aspect verb" (*khodit*, etc.) and "determinate aspect verb" (*idi*, etc.). Although this terminology is very precise and accurate, it will not enable American students faced with a concrete situation to choose confidently the proper verbal aspect. *Conversational Russian* contains the most satisfactory explanation of the usage of these verbal pairs. "Habitual, or general, action" verbs (*khodit*, etc.) are distinguished from verbs denoting "specific, or particular, action" (*idi*, etc.). Moreover, the author prudently emphasizes the rôle adverbs play in the correct usage of verbs of "going" and "carrying."

JOHN N. WASHBURN
New York City

Bibliography*

Books and Articles on Russia

Published in 1949

I BOOKS¹

- American Federation of Labor. *Slave Labor in Russia; the Case Presented by the Federation to the United Nations*. Washington, The Federation. 179 pp. \$3.00.
- American Russian Institute. *We Can Keep Peace*. San Francisco, The Institute. 20 pp. \$.15.
- Aronson, Gregor. *Soviet Russia and the Jews*. Tr. from Yiddish by B. Schultz. New York American Jewish League Against Communism. 51 pp. \$.50.
- Babkin, Boris P. *Pavlov; a Biography*. Chicago, University of Chicago. 364 pp. \$6.00.
- Bal'zak, S. S. and others. (Eds.) *Economic Geography of the U.S.S.R.* American ed., ed. by C. D. Harris; tr. by R. M. Hankin and O. A. Morrison. New York, Macmillan. 620 pp. \$10.00.
- Baum, Werner A. *Russian-English Dictionary of Meteorological Terms and Expressions*. Washington, Hobart. 130 pp. \$7.50.
- Baykov, Alexander. *Industrial Development in the U.S.S.R.* (University of Birmingham. *Bulletins on Soviet Economic Development* no. 1) 28 pp. 20s.
- Beal, Fred E. *Red Fraud; an Exposé of Stalinism*. Introd. by F. Lundberg; pref. by J. T. Farrell. New York, Tempo. 86 pp. \$1.00.
- Beloff, Max. *Foreign Policy of Soviet Russia, 1929-1941*. V.2, 1936-1941. New York, Oxford University. 434 pp. \$5.00.
- Brannigan, F. C. and Jukova, V. *Structure Drill in Russian*. Toronto, Clarke, Irwin. 116 pp. \$1.50.
- Browder, Earl. *U.S.A. & U.S.S.R.; Their Relative Strength*. Yonkers, N. Y., The Author. 48 pp. \$.25.
- Buber, Margarete. *Under Two Dictators*. Tr. from German by E. Fitzgerald. Toronto, Longmans, Green, 331 pp. \$5.00.
- Chavchavadze, Paul. *Family Album*. New York, Houghton Mifflin. 237 pp. \$3.00.
- Columbia University. Russian Institute. *Report on Research and Publications, September 1, 1948-September 1, 1949*. New York, The University. 12 pp.
- Counts, George S. and Lodge, N. P. *Country of the Blind; the Soviet System of Mind Control*. New York, Houghton Mifflin. 378 pp. \$4.00.
- Creel, George. *Russia's Race for Asia*. New York, Bobbs-Merrill. 264 pp. \$2.75.

*Compiled by Robert Swanton, Reference Librarian, Dartmouth College Library.

¹Due to limitation of space, reprints and revised editions have generally been excluded.

- Dallin, David J. *Rise of Russia in Asia*. New Haven, Yale University. 293 pp. \$5.00.
- Davis, Jerome. *Behind Soviet Power; Stalin and the Russians*. West Haven, Conn., The Author. 126 pp. \$2.75.
- Deutscher, Isaac. *Stalin; a Political Biography*. New York, Oxford University. 600 pp. \$5.00.
- Duddington, Nataliya A. *Intermediate Russian Reader*. London, Harrap. 171 pp. 6s.
- Duranty, Walter. *Stalin & Co.; the Politburo—the Men Who Run Russia*. New York, Sloane. 261 pp. \$3.00.
- Eckardt, Hans von. *Ivan the Terrible*. Tr. from German by C. A. Phillips. New York, Knopf. 421 pp. \$5.00.
- Eisenach, George J. *Pietism and the Russian Germans in the United States*. Yankton, S. D., The Author. 218 pp. \$2.00.
- Eliot, George F. *If Russia Strikes—*. New York, Bobbs-Merrill. 252 pp. \$2.75.
- Ely, Louis B. *Red Army Today*. Harrisburg, Pa., Military Service. 256 pp.
- Emmens, Robert G. *Guests of the Kremlin*. New York, Macmillan. 291 pp. \$3.00.
- Entwistle, William J. and Morison, W. A. *Russian and the Slavonic Languages*. New York, Macmillan. 407 pp. \$7.50.
- Fastenberg, Rashelle and Ratner, M. *Basic Russian Reader*. New York, Pitman. 269 pp. \$3.00.
- Fischer, Louis. (Ed.) *Thirteen Who Fled*. Tr. by G. and V. Fischer. New York, Harper. 244 pp. \$3.00.
- Foote, Alexander. *Handbook for Spies*. New York, Doubleday. 273 pp. \$3.00.
- Friends, Society of. American Friends Service Committee. *United States and the Soviet Union; Some Quaker Proposals for Peace; a Report Prepared for the Committee*. New Haven, Yale University. 39 pp. \$1.00.
- Garbutt, Paul E. *Russian Railways*. New York, Macdonald. 96 pp. \$1.00.
- George, Father (pseud.). *God's Underground; as Told to Greta Palmer*. New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts. 296 pp. \$3.00.
- Gorer, Geoffrey and Rickman, J. *People of Great Russia; a Psychological Study*. London, Cresset. 236 pp. 10s. 6d.
- Gudzy, Nikolay K. *History of Early Russian Literature*. Tr. from the second Russian ed. by S. W. Jones; introd. by G. Struve. New York, Macmillan. 545 pp. \$10.00.
- Guillaume, Augustin. *Soviet Arms and Soviet Power; the Secrets of Russia's Might*. Washington, Infantry Journal. 212 pp. \$3.50.
- Gunther, John. *Behind the Curtain*. New York, Harper. 363 pp. \$3.00.
- Gyorgy, Andrew and others. *Soviet Satellites; Studies of Politics in Eastern Europe*. Notre Dame, University of Notre Dame. 64 pp. \$1.00.
- Harper, Samuel N. and Thompson, R. *Government of the Soviet Union*. 2d ed. New York, Van Nostrand. 362 pp. \$3.75.
- Hazard, John N. *Russia Law Digest*. Reprinted from *Martindale-Hubbell Law Directory*, 1949 ed. Summit, N. J., Martindale-Hubbell. 11 pp.
- Hilton, Richard. *Military Attaché in Moscow*. Toronto, McClelland & Stewart. 232 pp. \$3.00.
- Huxley, Julian S. *Heredity East and West; Lysenko and World Science*. New York, Schuman. 246 pp. \$3.00.

- Jakobson, Roman and Simmons, E. J. (Eds.) *Russian Epic Studies*. Philadelphia, American Folk-Lore Society. 223 pp. \$4.50.
- Jasny, Naum. *Socialized Agriculture of the U.S.S.R.; Plans and Performance*. Stanford, Stanford University. 837 pp. \$7.50.
- Kareda, Endel. *Estonia in the Soviet Grip; Life and Conditions under Soviet Occupation, 1947-1949*. West Byfleet, England, Boreas. 100 pp. 3s. 6d.
- Kasenkina, Oksana. *Leap to Freedom*. Philadelphia, Lippincott. 295 pp. \$3.00.
- Kassarjian, Kevork. *Behind the Iron Altar*. New York, Cosmos. 224 pp. \$2.50.
- Krokodil (Periodical). *Out of the Crocodile's Mouth; Russian Cartoons about the United States from "Krokodil," Moscow's Humor Magazine*. Ed. by W. Nelson. Washington, Public Affairs. 116 pp. \$2.50.
- Kursky, A. *Planning of the National Economy of the U.S.S.R.* New York, Universal Distributors. 216 pp. \$.60.
- Kusnierz, Bronislaw. *Stalin and the Poles; an Indictment of the Soviet Leaders*. With a foreword by A. Zaleski. London, Hollis & Carter. 328 pp. 16s.
- Labin, Suzanne. *Stalin's Russia*. Tr. by E. Fitzgerald; with a foreword by A. Koestler. Toronto, Longmans, Green. 492 pp. \$6.00.
- Langdon-Davies, John. *Russia Puts the Clock Back; a Study of Soviet Science and Some British Scientists*. With a foreword by Sir Henry Dale. Toronto, Longmans, Green. 160 pp. \$1.50.
- Lasswell, Harold D. and others. *Language of Politics; Studies in Quantitative Semantics*. New York, Stewart. 398 pp. \$5.75.
- Lavaska, Anna. *Russian in Song*. Seattle, University of Washington. 80 pp. \$2.50.
- Lemieux, Claude P. *Russian Conversation and Grammar; an Inductive Method for First-Year Students*. Annapolis, U. S. Naval Institute. 216 pp. \$3.75.
- Lenczowski, George. *Russia and the West in Iran, 1918-1948; a Study in Big-Power Rivalry*. Ithaca, Cornell University. 383 pp. \$4.50.
- Lenin Academy of Agricultural Sciences of the U.S.S.R. *Proceedings, July 31-August 7, 1948; the Situation in Biological Science*. New York, International Publishers. 636 pp. \$5.00.
- Light, L. *Russian Science Readings*. London, Hirschfeld. 98 pp. 7s. 6d.
- Lundberg, Yngve and Hellström, S. *So This Is Russia*. Tr. from Swedish. London, Grey Walls. 96 pp. 5s.
- Lyashchenko, Peter I. *History of the National Economy of Russia to the 1917 Revolution*. Tr. by L. M. Herman; introd. by C. B. Hoover. New York, Macmillan. 880 pp. \$13.00.
- Madrigal, Margarita and Bleeker, S. *Invitation to Russian*. New York, Simon & Schuster. 198 pp. \$3.00.
- Magidoff, Robert. *In Anger and Pity; a Report on Russia*. New York, Doubleday. 278 pp. \$2.95.
- Markham, Reuben H. *Rumania under the Soviet Yoke*. Boston, Meador. 601 pp. \$4.00.
- Matthews, Tanya. *Russian Child and Russian Wife*. Toronto, Longmans, Green. 287 pp. \$3.75.
- Middleton, K. W. B. *Britain and Russia; an Historical Essay*. London, Hutchinson. 238 pp. 21s.
- Mikhailov, Nikolai N. *Across the Map of the U.S.S.R.* New York, Four Continent. 344 pp. \$1.25.

- Mirsky, Dimitri P. *History of Russian Literature*. Ed. and abr. by F. J. Whitfield. New York, Knopf. 2v. in 1. 518 pp. \$5.00.
- Mitchell, Mairin. *Maritime History of Russia, 848-1948*. London, Sidgwick & Jackson. 544 pp. 31s. 6d.
- Moisenco, Rena. *Realist Music; 25 Soviet Composers*. London, Meridian. 288 pp. 15s.
- Molotov, Vyacheslav M. *Problems of Foreign Policy*. New York, Universal Distributors. 610 pp. \$1.25.
- Morstein Marx, Fritz. (Ed.) *Foreign Governments; the Dynamics of Politics Abroad*. [Has chapters on Russia]. New York, Prentice Hall. 713 pp. \$6.35.
- Moscow. Institut Marksa-Engelsa-Lenina. *Joseph Stalin; a Political Biography*. New York, International Publishers. 128 pp. \$1.25.
- Nagy, Ferenc. *Struggle Behind the Iron Curtain*. Tr. from Hungarian by S. K. Swift. London, Macmillan. 471 pp. 30s.
- Parker, Ralph. *Moscow Correspondent*. Toronto, Saunders. 288 pp. \$2.50.
- Pavlovsky, Michel N. *Chinese-Russian Relations*. New York, Philosophical Library. 194 pp. \$3.75.
- Petrov, Vladimir. *Soviet Gold; My Life as a Slave Laborer in the Siberian Mines*. Tr. by M. Ginsburg. New York, Farrar, Straus. 426 pp. \$4.00.
- Pratt, Helen G. and Moore, H. L. *Russia; a Short History*. London, Cassell. 224 pp. 12s. 6d.
- Ranney, John C. and Carter, G. M. *Major Foreign Powers; the Governments of Great Britain, France, the Soviet Union, and China*. Under the general editorship of B. F. Wright. New York, Harcourt, Brace. 865 pp. \$7.50.
- Robinson, Geroid T. *Rural Russia under the Old Regime*. New Ed. New York, Macmillan. 342 pp. \$4.50.
- Rothstein, Andrew. *Man and Plan in Soviet Economy*. Toronto, Saunders. 300 pp. \$2.75.
- Rothstein, E. *Teach Yourself Russian Phrase Book*. Ed. by L. Cutts. London, English Universities. 144 pp. 4s. 6d.
- Roy, Manabendra N. *Russian Revolution*. Calcutta, Renaissance. 600 pp. Rs.18.
- Royal Institute of International Affairs. *Soviet-Yugoslav Dispute; Text of the Published Correspondence*. New York, The Institute. 79 pp. \$5.00.
- Schlesinger, Rudolf. (Ed.) *Changing Attitudes in Soviet Russia*. V.1, *The Family*. London, Routledge. 418 pp. 25s.
- Schwartz, Harry. *Russia's Soviet Economy*. Syracuse, Syracuse University Bookstore. 134 pp.
- . *Soviet Economy; a Selected Bibliography of Materials in English*. Syracuse, Syracuse University. 93 pp. \$2.25.
- Shapiro, Jacob. (Ed.) *Anthology of Russian Lyrics with Phonetic Renditions*. New York, Omega Music. \$1.00.
- Slavonic Encyclopaedia. Ed. by J. S. Roucek. New York, Philosophical Library. 1445 pp. \$18.50.
- Slonim, Marc L. *Epic of Russian Literature from Its Origins through Tolstoy*. New York, Oxford University. 367 pp. \$5.00.
- Smith, C. Henry. *Coming of the Russian Mennonites*. Newton, Kan., Mennonite Publication Office. 296 pp. \$1.00.

- Smithsonian Institution. *Contributions to Anthropology of Soviet Union*. Comp. by H. Field. Baltimore, Lord Baltimore. 244 pp. \$2.00.
- Spector, Ivar. *Introduction to Russian History and Culture*. New York, Van Nostrand. 454 pp. \$6.00.
- Stettinius, Edward R., Jr. *Roosevelt and the Russians; the Yalta Conference*. Ed. by W. Johnson. New York, Doubleday. 367 pp. \$4.00.
- Strakhovsky, Leonid I. *Alexander I of Russia*. London, Williams & Norgate. 302 pp. 16s.
- *Craftsmen of the Word; Three Poets of Modern Russia; Gumilyov, Akhmatova, Mandelstam*. Cambridge, Harvard University. 114 pp. \$3.00.
- Ed. *Handbook of Slavic Studies*. Cambridge, Harvard University. 753 pp. \$12.50.
- Sumner, Benedict H. *Peter the Great and the Ottoman Empire*. Oxford, England, Blackwell. 80 pp. 6s.
- Tolmachev, Innokenty P. *Siberian Passage; an Explorer's Search into the Russian Arctic*. New Brunswick, N. J., Rutgers University. 238 pp. \$3.50.
- Tompkins, Pauline. *American-Russian Relations in the Far East*. New York, Macmillan. 426 pp. \$5.00.
- Turin, Sergei P. *U.S.S.R.; an Economic and Social Survey*. 3d ed., rev. and enl. Forest Hills, N. Y., Transatlantic Arts. 274 pp. \$5.40.
- Turkevitch, Ludmilla B. *Cervantes in Russia*. Princeton, Princeton University. 276 pp. \$4.00.
- U. S. Congress. House. Committee on Un-American Activities. *Soviet Espionage Activities in Connection with Jet Propulsion and Aircraft; Hearings, June 6, 1949*. Washington, Government Printing Office. 29 pp. \$.10.
- *Soviet Espionage within the United States Government; Second Report, December 31, 1948*. Washington, Government Printing Office. 129 pp. \$.25.
- U. S. Department of State. *Cultural Relations between United States and Soviet Union*. Washington, Government Printing Office. 25 pp. \$.10.
- U. S. Department of State. Office of Libraries and Intelligence Acquisition. Division of Library and Reference Services. *Soviet Bibliography*. A current bibliography of books, pamphlets and articles in English. Washington, Government Printing Office. Issued fortnightly since June.
- Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. *Ukrainian Resistance; the Story of the Ukrainian National Liberation Movement in Modern Times*. New York, The Committee. 142 pp. \$3.00.
- Virski, Fred. *My Life in the Red Army*. New York, Macmillan. 260 pp. \$3.50.
- Voznesensky, Nikolai A. *Soviet Economy during the Second World War*. New York, International Publishers. 160 pp. \$2.25.
- Vyshinsky, Andrei Y. *Teaching of Lenin and Stalin on Proletarian Revolution and the State*. Tr. by A. Rothstein. London, *Soviet News*. 120 pp. 2s.
- *U.S.S.R. and World Peace*. Ed. by J. Smith. New York, International Publishers. 128 pp. \$1.50.
- Walshe, M. O'C. *Concise Russian Course*. London, Hirschfeld. 239 pp. 8s. 6d.

- Weigert, Hans W. and others. *New Compass of the World; a Symposium on Political Geography*. [Has chapters on Russian boundaries, etc.] New York, Macmillan. 375 pp. \$5.50.
- Werth, Alexander. *Musical Uproar in Moscow*. London, Turnstile. 103 pp. 6s.
- Westerner (pseud.). *Communism, Revolution and War; an Analysis of the Aims and Doctrines of Soviet Foreign Policy*. London, Conservative Political Centre. 39 pp. 1s. 6d.
- White, William L. *Land of Milk and Honey*. New York, Harcourt, Brace. 312 pp. \$3.00.
- Yakobson, Sergius. *Five Hundred Russian Works for College Libraries*. Washington, American Council of Learned Societies. 38 pp. \$.25.
- Yarmolinsky, Avrahm. (Ed.) *Treasury of Russian Verse*. New York, Macmillan. 314 pp. \$5.00.
- Zamorski, Kazimierz. (Silvester Mora, pseud.) *Kolyma; Gold and Forced Labor in the U.S.S.R.* Washington, Foundation for Foreign Affairs. 66 pp. \$1.00.
- Zirkle, Conway. (Ed.) *Death of a Science in Russia; the Fate of Genetics as Described in Pravda and Elsewhere*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania. 319 pp. \$3.75.
- Zweig, Stefan. *Living Thoughts of Tolstoy*. London, Cassell. 124 pp. 5s.

II ARTICLES²

- Acheson, D. "Success Has Its Problems Too." *Michigan State Bar Journal*, XXVIII: 20-24, February.
- Addington, J. S. "Postwar Russian Army." *Field Artillery Journal*, March.
- Alexandrov, B. "Soviet Currency Reform." *Russian Review*, VIII: 56-61, January.
- Alexandrova, V. "Postwar Literary Patterns of Soviet Russia." *Russian Review*, VIII: 221-229, July.
- Alexeiev, K. "Russia's Underground Capitalism." *Plain Talk*, IV: 19-24, December.
- Allen, W. D. "Music in Russia and the West." *Russian Review*, VIII: 102-110, April.
- Anders, W. "My Three Talks with Churchill When Britain Appeased Stalin." *Plain Talk*, III:1-7, May.
- Armstrong, H. F. "Tito and Stalin." *Atlantic Monthly*, CLXXXIV:30-36, October.
- Aron, P. H. "Soviet Handbook on the U.S.A." *American Slavic and East European Review*, VIII:137-144, April.
- Assmann, K. "Stalin and Hitler." *U. S. Naval Institute Proceedings*, LXXV:638-651, June; 759-773, July.
- Babel, I. E. "Sin of Jesus." Story; tr. by M. Ginsburg. *Partisan Review*, XVI:67-71, January.
- Bailey, T. A. "Russian-American Relations: Legend and Fact." *Pacific Spectator*, III:1:55-62.
- Bakerfield, J. "Soviet Foreign Policy Is a Peace Policy." *Political Affairs*, XXVIII: 10-24, November.

²All articles in weeklies have had to be excluded.

- Barghoorn, F. C. "Russian Radicals and the West European Revolutions of 1848." *Review of Politics*, XI:338-354, July.
- . "Soviet Union between War and Cold War." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CCLXIII:1-8, May.
- Baskin, M. "Soviet Evaluation of American Sociology." *American Sociological Review*, XIV: 137-143, February.
- "Behind the Iron Curtain: Lithuania, 1949." *Lithuanian Bulletin*, 1-19, January-March.
- Beloff, M. "No Peace, No War." *Foreign Affairs*, XXVII:215-231, January.
- Bennett, M. K. "Food and Agriculture in the Soviet Union, 1917-48." *Journal of Political Economy*, LVII:185-198, June.
- Bergo (pseud.) "Germany, Russia and China: a Century Ago and Now." *Soundings*, 20-24, June.
- Bergson, A. and others. "Postwar Economic Reconstruction and Development in the U.S.S.R." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CCLXIII:52-72, May.
- "Berlin Question: a Chronology." *Labour Research*, XXXVIII: 32-36, February.
- Berman, H. J. "Challenge of Soviet Law." *Harvard Law Review*, LXII:220-265, December, 1948; 444-466, January, 1949.
- Bittleman, A. "Stalin: on His Seventieth Birthday." *Political Affairs*, XXVIII: 1-13, December.
- Black, C. E. "Soviet Policy in Eastern Europe." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CCLXIII: 152-164, May.
- Blair, L. B. "Historical Examination of Soviet Foreign Policy." *U. S. Naval Institute Proceedings*, LXXV:972-981, September.
- "Books and Articles on Russia Published in 1948." *Russian Review*, VIII:253-264, July.
- Brand, C. L. "British Labor and Soviet Russia." *South Atlantic Quarterly*, XLVIII:327-340, July.
- Brasol, B. "From Pushkin's Lyrics." Translations. *Russian Review*, VIII:201-204, July.
- Brinton, C. "Pattern of Aggression." *Virginia Quarterly Review*, XXV: 161-178, Spring.
- Bryner, C. "People in the Politburo." *Current History*, XVI:257-261, May.
- . "Soviet Agricultural Policy." *Current History*, XVII:208-212, October.
- Bundy, M. "Test of Yalta." *Foreign Affairs*, XXVII:618-629, July.
- Calef, W. C. "Slavic Expansion in the Lands of the Soviet Union." *Journal of Geography*, XLVIII: 367-373, December.
- Carr, E. H. "From Munich to Moscow." *Soviet Studies*, I:3-17, June; 93-105, October.
- Chakste, M. "Latvia and the Soviet Union." *Journal of Central European Affairs*, IX:32-60, April; 173-211, July.
- . "Soviet Aggression and Its Historical and Ideological Background." *Baltic Review*, II:9-17, May.
- . "Soviet Concepts of the State, International Law and Sovereignty." *American Journal of International Law*, XLIII:21-36, January.
- "Change in the Nature of Soviet Collective Agreements." *Soviet Studies*, I:79-84, June.

- Chamberlain, J. L., Jr. "Notes on Russian Influences on the Nineteenth Century French Novel." *Modern Language Journal*, XXXIII: 374-383, May.
- Chamberlin, W. H. "American-Soviet Relations Since Yalta." *Russian Review*, VIII:95-101, April.
- Chekhov, A. "Cure for Hard Drinking" and "Surgery." Stories; tr. by A. Heifitz. *Russian Review*, VIII:334-342, October.
- Chubaty, N. "Ukrainian Independence Movement at the Time of the American Revolution." *Ukrainian Quarterly*, V:226-237, Summer.
- Cloutier, H. H. "Belinsky—Advocate of Liberty." *Russian Review*, VIII:20-33, January.
- Coleman, M. M. "Yale Man Studies Russian: James Gates Percival." *Russian Review*, VIII:127-134, April.
- "Collective Bargaining in the Soviet Union." *Harvard Law Review*, LXII:1191-1207, May.
- "Competing Ideologies in Korea." *World Today*, V:243-250, June.
- Cook, R. C. "Walpurgis Week in the Soviet Union." *Science Monthly*, LXVIII:367-372, June.
- Corbett, P. E. "Aleksandrov Story." *World Politics*, I:161-174, January.
- . "Postwar Soviet Ideology." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CCLXIII: 45-51, May.
- Craig, G. A. "Germany between the East and the West." *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, XXIII: 222-231, May.
- Dallin, A. "Month of Decision: German-Soviet Diplomacy, July 22-August 22, 1939." *Journal of Central European Affairs*, IX:1-31, April.
- Dallin, D. J. "Black Market in Russia." *American Mercury*, LXIX:676-684, December.
- DeGraaff, F. "Teaching of Soviet Literature." *Modern Language Journal*, XXXIII: 216-220, March.
- Delano, R. H. "Teaching Russian in the Private Secondary School." *Modern Language Journal*, XXXIII:124-128, February.
- Delougaz, N. "Some Significant Trends in Soviet Book Production." *Library Quarterly*, XIX: 250-262, October.
- Dobb, M. H. "Comment on Soviet Economic Statistics." *Soviet Studies*, I:18-27, June.
- Dobrianski, L. E. "Revived Myth of Ukrainian Anti-Semitism." *Ukrainian Quarterly*, V:164-174, Spring.
- Dorpalen, A. "Germany between East and West." *Virginia Quarterly Review*, XXV:500-514, Autumn.
- Eagleton, C. "United States, U.N., U.S.S.R." *Southwest Review*, 24-32, Winter.
- Edgerton, W. "Serapion Brothers: an Early Soviet Controversy." *American Slavic and East European Review*, VIII: 47-64, February.
- Ernst, L. "Inside a Soviet Industry." Ed. by J. Scott. *Fortune*, XL:116-119ff., October.
- Evans, A. R. "Girl Who Walked Home to Russia." *Coronet*, XXVI: 60-64, September.
- Fainsod, M. "Postwar Rôle of the Communist Party." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CCLXIII: 20-32, May.
- . "Recent Developments in Soviet Public Administration." *Journal of Politics*, XI:679-714, November.

- Fischer, G. "General Vlasov's Official Biography." *Russian Review*, VIII:284-301, October.
- . "New Soviet Emigration." *Russian Review*, VIII:6-19, January.
- . "Russian Archive in Prague." *American Slavic and East European Review*, VIII: 289-295, December.
- Fisher, H. H. "Soviet Policies in Asia." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CCLXIII:188-201, May.
- Fisher, R. B. "American Investments in Pre-Soviet Russia." *American Slavic and East European Review*, VIII:90-105, April.
- Florinsky, M. "Twilight of Absolutism: 1905." *Russian Review*, VIII: 322-333, October.
- Fotitch, C. A. "Liberation of Eastern Europe." *American Perspective*, III: 119-124, June.
- Frank, V. "Varga Controversy." *Soundings*, 38-43, May.
- Freund, W. H. C. "Analysis of the Berlin Situation." *Third Force*, 24-30, Spring.
- Fuller, C. D. "Lenin's Attitude toward an International Organization for the Maintenance of Peace, 1914-1917." *Political Science Quarterly*, CLXIV:245-261, June.
- . "Soviet Policy in the United Nations." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CCLXIII:141-151, May.
- Fuller, L. L. "Pashukanis and Vyshinsky." *Michigan Law Review*, XLVII:1157-1166, June.
- Galantière, L. "Through the Russian Looking Glass." *Foreign Affairs*, XXVIII: 114-124, October.
- Germain, E. "Purge of Soviet Culture." *Fourth International*, X: 332-336, December.
- Gerschenkron, A. "Russia's Trade in the Postwar Years." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CCLXIII:85-100, May.
- Gifford, H. "Pushkin's 'Feast in Time of Plague' and Its Original." *American Slavic and East European Review*, VIII:37-46, February.
- "Gigantic Plan for the Transformation of Nature." *U.S.S.R. in Construction*, no. 3, 2-12.
- Gorer, G. "Some Aspects of the Psychology of the People of Great Russia." *American Slavic and East European Review*, VIII: 155-166, October.
- Green, L. C. "Berlin and the United Nations." *World Affairs*, n.s. III:23-42, January.
- Grierson, P. "Books and Pamphlets on Russia, 1948." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXVII: 556-562, May.
- Gross, F. "Russian Political Emigration of 1948." *Journal of Central European Affairs*, IX:150-158, July.
- Guins, G. C. "East and West in Soviet Ideology." *Russian Review*, VIII:271-283, October.
- . "Politics of 'Pan Slavism.'" *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, VIII:125-132, January.
- Hallgarten, G. W. F. "General Hans von Seeckt and Russia, 1920-1922." *Journal of Modern History*, XXI:28-34, March.
- Hammond, T. T. "Lenin on Russian Trade Unions under Capitalism, 1894-1904." *American Slavic and East European Review*, VIII: 275-288, December.

- Hans, N. "Recent Trends in Soviet Education." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CCLXIII:114-122, May.
- Hayward, J. F. "Imperial Russian Arms Factory of Tula." *Apollo*, L:43-45, August; 69-71, September.
- Hazard, J. N. "Law Practice in Russia." *American Bar Association Journal*, XXXV: 177-180, 264-270, March.
- . "Political, Administrative, and Judicial Structure in the U.S.S.R. Since the War." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CCLXIII:9-19, May.
- . "Soviet Court as a Source of Law." *Washington Law Review*, XXIV:80-90, February.
- . "Soviet Leadership Problems." *Political Quarterly*, XX:225-235, July-September.
- Heiden, K. "Why They Confess." *Reader's Digest*, LV:22-26, September.
- Heimann, E. "Marxism: 1848 and 1948." *Journal of Politics*, XI: 523-531, August.
- . "West and the East." *Social Research*, XVI: 45-69, March.
- Heitzmann, M. "Events behind the Iron Curtain." *International Journal*, IV:291-310, Autumn.
- Hermann, L. J. "Communist Squeeze on Austria." *South Atlantic Quarterly*, XLVIII:192-203, April.
- Heymann, H. "Iranian Oil Concessions." *Fortnightly*, CLXXII (n.s. CLXVI):185-190, September; 244-251, October.
- Himmelman, H. A. "Democratization of Justice in the Soviet Zone." *Contemporary Review*, CLXXVI:29-33, July.
- Hook, S. "Communism and the Intellectuals." *American Mercury*, LXVIII:133-144, February.
- Howard, H. N. "Soviet Union and the Middle East." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CCLXIII:184-187, May.
- Howley, F. L. "I've Talked 1600 Hours with the Russians." *Reader's Digest*, LIV:73-78, May.
- Hudson, G. F. "Red Army Purge of 1937." *Contemporary Review*, CLXXV:289-296, May.
- Hunter, H. "Planning of Investments in the Soviet Union." *Review of Economic Statistics*, XXXI:54-62, February.
- "Information Concerning Soviet Exit Visas." *Interpreter Releases*, XXVI:319-323, October.
- Inkeles, A. "Family and Church in the Postwar U.S.S.R." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CCLXIII:33-44, May.
- Jasny, N. "Soviet Agriculture and the Fourth Five Year Plan." *Russian Review*, VIII:135-141, April.
- Johnson, J. E. "Soviet Union, the United States and International Security." *International Organization*, III:1-13, February.
- Karpovich, M. "Sir Bernard Pares." *Russian Review*, VIII:183-185, July.
- Katkov, G. "Steerforth and Stavrogin." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXVII:469-488, May.
- Kelly, M. A. "Communists in German Labor Organizations." *Journal of Political Economy*, LVII: 213-226, June.
- Kelpsh, A. E. "Rubles of Peter the Great." *Numismatist*, LXII:161-174, March.

- Kempton, M. "How Moscow's WFTU Plots." *Plain Talk*, III: 13-19, May.
- Kerner, R. J. "Russia in the Far East." *Yale Review*, XXXVIII: 698-711, June.
- Kertesz, S. "Plight of Satellite Diplomacy." *Review of Politics*, XI:26-62, January.
- Kiefer, J. E. "Russia and International Law." *Tulane Law Review*, XXIII:368-374, March.
- Kline, G. L. "Leo Tolstoy's 'A History of Yesterday.'" Translation. *Russian Review*, VIII:142-160, April.
- Kohn, H. "Eastern Europe, 1948." *Current History*, XVI:72-78, February; 193-198, April.
- Korostovetz, V. de. "Ukrainians in Exile." *Contemporary Review*, CLXXVI:82-86, August.
- Kraev, M. "Collective Farm Labour-Day." *Soviet Studies*, I:166-171, October.
- Krehel, P. "Religion in the Soviet Community of States." *Common Cause*, III:82-91, September.
- Kruger, M. "Unpublished Tragedy by Nikolai Gumilev." *American Slavic and East European Review*, VIII:175-184, October.
- Kuchеров, S. "Problem of Constantinople and the Straits." *Russian Review*, VIII:205-220, July.
- Kulischer, E. M. "Russian Population Enigma." *Foreign Affairs*, XXVIII: 497-501, April.
- Lang, D. M. "Decembrist Conspiracy through British Eyes." *American Slavic and East European Review*, VIII: 262-274, December.
- Langdon-Davies, J. "Russian Attack on Reason." *Fortnightly*, CLXXI (n.s. CLXV):308-314, May.
- Lasswell, H. D. "Inevitable War." *World Politics*, II:1-39, October.
- Lattimore, O. "Opening of Asia." *Atlantic Monthly*, CLXXXIII: 29-33, March.
- Lednicki, W. "Prose of Pushkin." Part I. *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXVIII:105-122, November.
- Lee, A. "Soviet Air Power." *Nineteenth Century and After*, CXLV: 354-362, June.
- Lefevre, C. "Gogol and Anglo-Russian Literary Relations during the Crimean War." *American Slavic and East European Review*, VIII: 106-125, April.
- Lefschetz, S. "Scientific Research in the U.S.S.R.: Mathematics." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CCLXIII:139-140, May.
- Leikind, M. C. "Genetics Controversy in the U.S.S.R.: a Bibliographic Survey." *Journal of Heredity*, XL: 203-208, July.
- Lemieux, C. P. "Audio-visual Aids in the Teaching of Russian." *Modern Language Journal*, XXX-III:594-602, December.
- Lenin, N. "Unpublished Documents of V. I. Lenin." *Labour Monthly*, XXXI:187-190, June; 243-247, August; 279-282, September.
- Lessner, E. C. "Russia's Secret Gibraltar: the Island of Saseno and Valona Bay." *Harper's Magazine*, CIC:31-37, September.
- Lewis, J. D. "Marxism, Revolution, and Democracy: 1848-1948." *Journal of Politics*, XI: 518-522, August.
- Lewitter, L. R. "Poland, the Ukraine and Russia in the 17th Century." Part II. *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXVII: 414-429, May.

- Liddell Hart, B. H. "Red War Machine." *Ordinance*, May.
- Lilge, F. "Lessons from Soviet History Textbooks." *Educational Forum*, XIV:59-63, November.
- Lippmann, W. "Russian-American War." *Atlantic Monthly*, CLXXXIV:17-21, July.
- Lissner, W. "Land Socialization in Soviet Agriculture, 1917-1949." *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, IX:145-159, October.
- Listowel, J. "Men of the Politburo." *Soundings*, 22-30, March.
- . "Soviet Slaves: a Statistical Survey." *Soundings*, 55-61, January.
- Lockhart, R. B. "Behind the Iron Curtain." *Commonwealth Empire Review*, LXXXIII: 15-19, April.
- Loewenson, L. "Karl Stählin: 1865-1939." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXVIII:152-160, November.
- Lopatin, I. A. "Distinctive Characteristics of Russian Civilization." *World Affairs Interpreter*, XX:147-163, Summer.
- Lukacs, J. A. "Political Expediency and Soviet Russia Military Operations." *Journal of Central European Affairs*, VIII:390-411, January.
- Lyons, E. "Mystery of Katyn." *Plain Talk*, IV:53-64, October.
- Maitland, P. "Russia's Peace Offensive." *Soundings*, 23-32, April.
- Makhiv, H. "New Cultivated Crops in Ukraine." *Ukrainian Quarterly*, V:318-323, Autumn.
- Malnick, B. "Moscow Art Theatre." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXVII: 563-570, May.
- . "V. G. Belinsky." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXVII: 363-380, May.
- Manning, C. A. "Socialist Realism and the American Success Novel." *South Atlantic Quarterly*, XLVIII: 213-219, April.
- . "Total War and the Ukraine." *Ukrainian Quarterly*, V:324-330, Autumn.
- Marchenko, V. "Rôle of the Ukraine in the Present Five-Year Plan." *Ukrainian Quarterly*, V:122-124, Spring.
- Martin, A. B. "Children's Books about Foreign Countries: Russia." *Elementary English*, XXVI:202-211, April.
- Massey, I. M. "Diplomatic Origins of the First World War." *International Affairs*, XXV:182-191, April.
- Matthews, W. K. "Medieval Baltic Tribes." *American Slavic and East European Review*, VIII:126-136, April.
- . "Professor M. V. Trofimov." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXVII:575-576, May.
- McLean, H., Jr. "Voronskii and VAPP." *American Slavic and East European Review*, VIII: 185-200, October.
- Menken, J. "Stalin and His Russia." *Nineteenth Century and After*, CXLVI:395-404, December, 1949; CXLVII:17-34, January, 1950.
- Miller, J. "Some Recent Developments in Soviet Economic Thought." *Soviet Studies*, I:119-127, October.
- Miller, J. and M. "Andrei Zhdanov's Speech to the Philosophers." *Soviet Studies*, I:40-51, June.
- Millis, W. "Great Wall of Russia." *Yale Review*, XXXVIII:588-597, June.
- Mishchenko, M. "Hunger as a Method of Terror and Rule in the Soviet Union." *Ukrainian Quarterly*, V:219-225, Summer.

- . "Medical Science in Ukraine under the Soviets." *Ukrainian Quarterly*, V:310-317, Autumn.
- Mohrenschildt, D. von. "Russian Review, 1941-1949." *Russian Review*, VIII:3-5, January.
- Moorad, G. L. "How Good Is Soviet Medicine?" *American Mercury*, LXIX:578-585, November.
- Morgan, G. (Historicus, pseud.). "Stalin on Revolution." *Foreign Affairs*, XXVII: 175-214, January.
- Morse, J. L. "Way to Fight Russia." *Catholic Digest*, XIII:89-93, September.
- "Moscow Patriarchate and the First Assembly of the World Council of Churches." *Ecumenical Review*, I:2:188-197.
- Mosley, P. E. "Soviet-American Relations Since the War." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CCLXIII:202-211, May.
- Mowrer, E. A. "Only Way to Handle Russia." *Coronet*, XXV: 72-76, February.
- Muller, E. "Peter the Great." *Reader's Digest*, LIV:103-108, April.
- Munzer, E. "Solovyev and the Meaning of History." *Review of Politics*, XI:281-293, July.
- Nabokov, N. "Russian Music After the Purge." *Partisan Review*, XVI:842-851, August.
- Nagengast, W. E. "Moscow, the Stalingrad of 1812." *Russian Review*, VIII:302-315, October.
- . "Visit of the Russian Fleet to the United States: Were Americans Deceived?" *Russian Review*, VIII:46-55, January.
- Nagy, F. "Stalin's War on the Peasants." *Reader's Digest*, LIV: 77-81, June.
- Nandris, G. "Old and New Paths in Slavonic Philology." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXVIII:84-104, November.
- Nemzer, L. "Soviet Friendship Societies." *Public Opinion Quarterly*, XIII:265-284, Summer.
- Neumann, F. L. "Soviet Policy in Germany." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CCLXIII:165-179, May.
- Neumann, R. G. "U. S. Foreign Policy and the Soviet Satellites." *Review of Politics*, XI:220-236, April.
- Nicolaevsky, B. "Russia, Japan, and the Pan-Asiatic Movement to 1925." *Far Eastern Quarterly*, VIII:259-295, May.
- Nikolaieff, A. M. "Universal Military Service in Russia and Western Europe." *Russian Review*, VIII:117-126, April.
- North, R. C. and Paasche, J. H. "Moscow and the Chinese Communists." *Pacific Spectator*, III: 2:141-152.
- "North Atlantic Treaty." Statements by Secretary of State Acheson; declaration of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R. *International Organization*, III:393-406, May.
- Nove, A. "Soviet Constitutional Theory—Some Aspects." *Modern Law Review*, XII: 12-36, January.
- Noyes, G. R. "Bernard Pares." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXVIII:32-35, November.
- Nutting, C. B. "Soviet Public Law: Claims and Realities." *Pennsylvania Bar Association Quarterly*, XXI:31-39, October.

- O'Brien, C. B. "Agriculture in Russian War Economy in the Later Seventeenth Century." *American Slavic and East European Review*, VIII:167-174, October.
- Ohloblyn, A. "Ukrainian Humanities and the Soviets." *Ukrainian Quarterly*, V:10-19, Winter.
- Oras, A. "Soviet Policy in Estonia." *Journal of Central European Affairs*, VIII:366-376, January.
- Oster, G. "Scientific Research in the U.S.S.R.: Organization and Planning." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CCLXIII:134-139, May.
- Page, S. W. "Social and National Currents in Latvia, 1860-1917." *American Slavic and East European Review*, VIII:25-36, February.
- Payzs, T. "Soviet Foreign Policy: a New Look." *University of Detroit Law Journal*, XII:147-158, May.
- Piscatella, A. M. "God behind the Iron Curtain." *Catholic World*, CLXIX:191-197, June.
- Plough, H. H. "Bourgeois Genetics and Party-Line Darwinism." *American Scholar*, XVIII:291-303, July.
- Preuss, L. "Consular Immunities—the Kasenkina Case." *American Journal of International Law*, XLIII:37-56, January.
- Price, M. P. "Russia and Europe." *Contemporary Review*, CLXXVI:321-326, December.
- . "Russia's Eastern Drive." *Contemporary Review*, CLXXV:129-134, March.
- "Prof. Kedrov on Philosophy and National Self-Assertion." *Soviet Studies*, I:84-91, June.
- Protsiuk, S. "Evacuation of Industry in 1941 and the Post-War Economy of Ukraine." *Ukrainian Quarterly*, V:210-218, Summer.
- Raeff, M. "Early Theorist of Absolutism: Joseph of Volokolamsk." *American Slavic and East European Review*, VIII:77-89, April.
- Reavey, G. "Russian Thought Pattern." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXVII:450-468, May.
- Reiss, M. "Socialism Means Peace." *Political Affairs*, XXVIII:25-39, November.
- Rosa, R. A. "Soviet Theory of 'People's Democracy.'" *World Politics*, I:489-510, July.
- Roucek, J. S. "'Tito-ism' and the Growth of a New National Communist Movement." *World Affairs Interpreter*, XX:233-240, Autumn.
- Sadak, N. S. "Turkey Faces the Soviets." *Foreign Affairs*, XXVII:449-461, April.
- Sandomirsky, V. "Russian Cosmopolitanism: 1949." *Common Cause*, II:341-346, April.
- . "'We Who Loved Thee, O Russia.'" *Common Cause*, III:199-211, November.
- Schechtman, J. B. "Polish-Soviet Exchange of Population." *Journal of Central European Affairs*, IX:289-314, October.
- Schlesinger, R. A. J. "Biology Discussion: a Commentary." *Soviet Studies*, I:106-118, October.
- . "Discussions on E. Varga's Book on Capitalist War Economy." *Soviet Studies*, I:28-40, June.
- Schneider, E. V. "American Liberal-Intellectual Attitudes toward the Soviet Union." *Social Forces*, XXVII:251-256, March.
- Schwartz, H. "Soviet Labor Policy 1945-1949." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CCLXIII:73-84, May.

- Schwarz, S. M. "Nationalities in Russia." *Modern Review*, III: 53-70, Summer.
- . "New Anti-Semitism of the Soviet Union." *Commentary*, VII:535-545, June.
- Scott, H. G. "Communism as an Historical Episode." *International Journal*, IV:47-51, Winter.
- "Security Council and the Berlin Question." *International Law Quarterly*, II:646-655, Winter.
- Selehen, H. "Soviet Family Life." *Ukrainian Quarterly*, V:340-346, Autumn.
- Seligman, D. "Soviet Strategy for Power." *Plain Talk*, IV:34-40, December.
- Seton-Watson, R. W. "Unprinted Documents: Russo-British Relations, 1875-1878." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXVIII: 218-228, November.
- Skerpan, A. A. "Idea of World Revolution." *South Atlantic Quarterly*, XLVIII:169-191, April.
- Slonim, M. "Soviet Prose After the War." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CCLXIII:101-113, May.
- Smal-Stocky, R. "Right of Self-Determination of the Non-Russian Nationalities in the Soviet Union." *Ukrainian Quarterly*, V:360-365, Autumn.
- . "Soviet Semantics." *Ukrainian Quarterly*, V:71-77, Winter.
- Smith, C. A. "Westward-Flowing Darkness." *World Affairs*, n.s. III:122-132, April.
- Smith, T. V. "Property of Privacy." *Virginia Quarterly Review*, XXV: 335-347, Summer.
- Smogorzewski, K. M. "Soviet Economic Position." *Contemporary Review*, CLXXVI:96-100, August.
- "Soil Conservation in the U.S.S.R." *Land Economy*, XXV:333-364, November.
- Sokol, A. E. "Nelson and the Russian Navy." *Military Affairs*, XIII:129-137, Fall.
- Soloveytchik, G. "After the Blockade." *Contemporary Review*, CLXXV:325-330, June.
- "Some Materials on the Recent Attacks against Cosmopolitanism." *Soviet Studies*, I:178-188, October.
- Sorokin, P. A. "Real Causes of the Russian-American Conflict." *World Affairs*, n.s. III:113-121, April.
- "Soviet Dramatic Criticism: Political Conformity and Artistic Conscience." *World Today*, V:202-211, May.
- Stalin, J. "Unpublished Writings of Stalin." *Labour Monthly*, XXXI:361-368, December.
- Stanford, N. "Poland: Pattern of Soviet Duplicity." *American Mercury*, LXIX:71-82, July.
- . "State Department's Report on Russia in the UN." *American Mercury*, LXVIII:281-290, March.
- Strakhovsky, L. I. "Georgi Ivanov—Paragon of Verse." *Russian Review*, VIII:70-77, January.
- Struve, G. "Anti-Westernism in Recent Soviet Literature." *Yale Review*, XXXIX:209-224, December.
- . "Belinsky Centenary Bibliography: an Annotated List of 1948 Publications." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXVII: 546-555.
- . "From Peter Struve's Unpublished Correspondence." *Russian Review*, VIII:62-69, January.

- "Pushkin in Early English Criticism: 1821-1838." *American Slavic and East European Review*, VIII:296-314, December.
- Swan, J. B. and Kirchner, W. "Episode in the Great Russian Revolution: the Children's Colonies in Siberia." *Delaware Notes*, XXII:1-11.
- Taborsky, E. "Benes and the Soviets." *Foreign Affairs*, XXVII:302-314, January.
- Tartak, E. L. "Prince Igor in America." *Russian Review*, VIII:230-233, July.
- "Technique of Soviet Interrogation." *World Today*, V:145-153, April.
- Timakhov, N. and Israels, J., 2d. "How Russia Uses White Slaves as Red Spies." *Coronet*, XXVI:44-50, May.
- Timasheff, N. S. "Postwar Trends in the U.S.S.R." *Russian Review*, VIII:186-200, July.
- "Tito's Ukrainian Forerunners." *Ukrainian Quarterly*, V:293-299, Autumn.
- "Tito-Stalin Conflict: Statement of National Committee of Socialist Workers Party." *Fourth International*, X:259-264, October.
- Tompkins, S. R. and Moorhead, M. L. "Russia's Approach to America." Part I. *British Columbia Historical Quarterly*, XIII:55-67, April.
- Towster, J. "Problems in Understanding Russia." *Forum*, CXII:200-204, October.
- "Soviet Federation." *Current History*, XVI:131-135, March.
- Twarog, L. I. "Aldanov as an Historical Novelist." *Russian Review*, VIII:234-244, July.
- Ulam, A. B. "Yugoslav-Russian Dispute and Its Implications." *World Politics*, I:414-425, April.
- Underhill, G. "Story of Soviet Armor." *Armored Cavalry Journal*, January.
- Ungarn, L. "Litvinov Era." *Thought*, XXIV:5-9, March.
- Vagts, A. "Russian Diplomatic History." *World Politics*, II:96-119, October.
- Vakar, N. P. "Name 'White Russia.'" *American Slavic and East European Review*, VIII:201-213, October.
- Varma, A. "Soviet Policy toward the Baltic States." *Third Force*, 5-10, Summer.
- Vernadsky, G. "Problem of the Early Russian Campaigns in the Black Sea Area." *American Slavic and East European Review*, VIII:1-9, February.
- Vishniak, M. "Sovereignty in Soviet Law." *Russian Review*, VIII:34-45, January.
- Voigt, F. A. "Russian and Chinese Revolutions." *Soundings*, 5-12, August; 18-24, September; 21-29, October; 37-41, November; 17-20, December 1949; 35-45, January 1950.
- Vucinich, A. "Kolkhoz: Its Social Structure and Development." *American Slavic and East European Review*, VIII:10-24, February.
- Vucinich, W. S. "Poland's Fate: Yalta to Potsdam." *Current History*, XVII:15-21, July.
- Waddams, H. M. "Communism and the Churches." *International Affairs*, XXV:295-306, July.
- Wainwright, W. "Soviet Union's Budget." *Labour Monthly*, XXXI:142-147, May.
- Wallace, W. S. "Russian Incident: 1894-1897." Publications of the *American Jewish Historical Society*, September.

- Walsh, W. B. "Composition of the Dumas." *Russian Review*, VIII: 111-116, April.
- . "Pobedonostsev and Panslavism." *Russian Review*, VIII:316-321, October.
- Walters, E. "Franco-Russian Discussions on the Partition of Austria-Hungary 1899." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXVIII:184-197, November.
- Warburg, J. P. "Defense of Western Europe." *Harper's Magazine*, CXCIII:34-38, June.
- Webb, M. K. "Magistrate's Court in Moscow." *Harper's Magazine*, CIC:76-82, August.
- Weintraub, W. "Mickiewicz and Bakunin." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXVIII:72-83, November.
- Weisberg, M. L. "Transformation of the Collective Agreement in Soviet Law." *University of Chicago Law Review*, XVI: 444-481, Spring.
- White, J. B. "How's Business in Russia?" *Atlantic Monthly*, CLXXXIII:29-33, April.
- Wish, H. "Getting Along with the Romanovs." *South Atlantic Quarterly*, XLVIII:341-359, July.
- Wolff, M. M. "Aspects of Marriage and Divorce Laws in Soviet Russia." *Modern Law Review*, XII: 290-296, July.
- Wolfson, V. "Old Comrades: Reminiscences." *Harper's Magazine*, CIC:54-59, August.
- Wright, L. H. "Gsovski's Soviet Civil Law: a Synopsis." *Michigan State Bar Journal*, XXVIII: 15-20, April.
- Yakobson, "Postwar Historical Research in the Soviet Union." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CCLXIII:123-133, May.
- . "Soviet Concept of Satellite States." *Journal of Politics*, XI: 184-195, February.
- Ypsilon (pseud.). "Commissar in the U. N." *Plain Talk*, IV:1-8, November.
- Zauberman, A. "Economic Thought in the Soviet Union." *Review of Economic Studies*, XVI: 1-12, Winter.
- Zernov, N. "St. Vladimir and the Origin of the Russian Church." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXVIII:123-138, November.
- Zon, R. "Volga Valley Authority." *Unasylva*, III:55-62, March.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

ON THE NORTHERN SEA ROUTE

The excellent article, "The Northern Sea Route," by Professor Trevor Lloyd (*The Russian Review*, April, 1950), dealing with the development of the North Arctic sea route between the Pacific and Atlantic oceans, contains a few misstatements which should be clarified.

The author, after discussing the valuable contributions which the Imperial Russian Government has made towards the exploration of the above sea route, unfortunately gives misleading facts regarding the Russian explorations prior to World War I.

From 1910 to 1914, several expeditions were accomplished (not one as stated by Professor Lloyd), culminating with the last (the fifth one) which began on July 7, 1914, from Vladivostok and ended on September 14, 1914, in Archangel, when the two ice-cutting ships, "Taimyr" and "Vaigach," under the command of Lieutenant-Commander B. A. Vilkitsky, were the first, in the history of Arctic sea voyages, to sail successfully from East to West, i.e., from the Pacific to the Atlantic.

It is obvious why the Soviet government gives so little mention to this historical and unique feat yet, there is no doubt that Vilkitsky's expedition was fully utilized later by the Bolshevik régime. Moreover, if it were not for the outbreak of World War I, this voyage would have received more publicity than it did. (See an account of this expedition in the *Geographical Journal*, N. Y. vol. 54, pp. 367-375, "Vilkitsky North-East Passage, 1914-15.")

To amplify Professor Lloyd's statement one should briefly outline these early expeditions.

In 1909, from the dockyards of St. Petersburg, two sister ships of ice-cutting type (1500 tons), the "Taimyr" and the "Vaigach," were launched. Equipped with radio apparatus, with a transmission of 100-120 miles and carrying coal sufficient for 12,000 miles of navigation, they left the autumn of that year and proceeded to Vladivostok via the Indian Ocean. In 1910, 1911, and 1912, they began their preliminary expeditions into the North Arctic. Already in 1911, for the first time, the steamer "Kolyma" of the Volunteer Fleet, made a successful commercial voyage from Vladivostok to the Kolyma River and back, thus inaugurating a regular steamship service.

Finally, in 1913, the "Taimyr" and "Vaigach" ventured far enough into the Arctic and discovered on September 2, 1913, a low island named "Tsarevich Alexey," 30 nautical miles off Cape Cheluskin. The next day the expedition made its major discovery—the "Nicholas II Land" (later renamed by the Soviets "Lenin Land" and finally changed to "Northern Land" or "*Severnaya Zemlya*"). Both ships arrived in Vladivostok on November 25, 1913, after completing 13,000 miles of navigation.

But it was the fifth and most important expedition which made history. On July 7, 1914, three weeks before Russia entered the war, the two ships, "Taimyr" and "Vaigach" under the command of the 29-year old Lieut.-Commander B. A. Vilkitsky, sailed from Vladivostok with the intention of reaching Archangel via the Northeast route. This remarkable feat was accomplished on September 14, 1915, when *both ships* entered the port of Archangel amidst a great rejoicing of the population. Thus, Vilkitsky was the first in history to make the passage from East to West. (See N. A. Transehe, "The Siberian Sea Road; the Work of the Russian Hydrographical Expedition to the Arctic, 1910-1915," N. Y., *Geographical Review*, Vol. 15, July, 1925.)

The war and the ensuing Revolution of 1917, brought a halt to further explorations, but it fell to the Soviet government to continue the task which Imperial Russia so successfully began.

Alexander Tarsaidze

► *Important New Books on Russia Today and Yesterday* ◄

Public Opinion in Soviet Russia

By Alex Inkeles

HOW the Soviet Union, through the use of modern techniques of mass communication, has mobilized public opinion in support of the Communist Party and the Soviet regime is revealed in this remarkably illuminating and readable book. Mr. Inkeles examines the organization of and methods employed in press, radio, film, and oral agitation to mold the minds and wills of the Russian people, and his analysis throws much light on the important general question of the place of mass communication in modern society. *Russian Research Center Studies, 1.* \$5.00

THE Election to the Russian Constituent Assembly of 1917

By Oliver Henry Radkey

THE only truly democratic election in Russian history has a remarkable interest for all who are concerned with the serious study of modern Russia. Mr. Radkey, in this clear, fast-moving and enlightening study of the election returns, conclusively demonstrates that in November 1917, the Russian people were in a thoroughly revolutionary frame of mind. Extremely valuable not only to historians but to all concerned with Soviet internal development. *Harvard Historical Monographs, 21.* \$2.50

► *At all bookstores, or* ◄



HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS *Cambridge 38, Mass.*

Monumental history and analysis of

RUSSIAN FOLKLORE

By Y. M. SOKOLOV

FROM gay wedding songs to wailing lamentations, this history of Russian folklore contains many examples of the riches of Russian *byliny*, *chastushkas*, proverbs, riddles, lyric poetry, rhymes, songs, and old and modern folklore of the mills and factories. It tells of the rites of spring, the curling of the beard of the he-goat, picturesque wedding rituals, weddings by abduction, and

reveals the strange fusion of Christian and pagan elements in Russian folklore.

Included is "a highly interesting summary of western folkloristics from the viewpoint of an outsider . . . the best bird's eye summary I've found to date."—ELAINE LAMBERT, *Library Journal*. A magnificent book for every student of culture.

\$10.00

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

